



HOUSE OF COMMONS
CHAMBRE DES COMMUNES
CANADA

45th PARLIAMENT, 1st SESSION

House of Commons Debates

Official Report
(Hansard)

Volume 152 No. 058
Friday, November 21, 2025

Speaker: The Honourable Francis Scarpaleggia



CONTENTS

(Table of Contents appears at back of this issue.)

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Friday, November 21, 2025

The House met at 10 a.m.

Prayer

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

• (1005)

[*English*]

BUDGET 2025 IMPLEMENTATION ACT, NO. 1

The House resumed from November 20 consideration of the motion that Bill C-15, An Act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on November 4, 2025, be read the second time and referred to a committee, and of the amendment.

Pat Kelly (Calgary Crowfoot, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I think everyone here is old enough to remember the year 2015. That was the year the Harper government brought the budget back into balance after successfully steering Canada through the great recession and when the New York Times congratulated Canada for having the world's most prosperous middle class. This was a few years after the Liberals tried to topple the government because Harper's government refused to run larger deficits than were necessary to steer Canada through the 2008-09 financial crash. He had run a disciplined government, one focused on core government services and responsibilities.

That same year, the Liberals alone campaigned on a promise to run what they called modest deficits for three years that would fund unprecedented generational investments that would boost productivity and allow the budget to balance itself. That was the year the Liberals destroyed the consensus that successive Liberal and Conservative governments shared: that deficits matter, that debt matters, that fiscal discipline matters, that productivity matters and that all of these things directly impact everyday Canadians and their struggles to make ends meet.

Here we are, 10 years later, and no historic transformational public investments occurred. During that time, the budget was never balanced and the national debt doubled. The amount spent on Liberal consultants ballooned out of control despite the federal public service increasing by 100,000 employees, while service levels for Canadians declined. The armed forces still have rusting ships, 40-year-old fighter jets, only a few dozen operational tanks and crumbling barracks and housing. The CRA still cannot answer the phone or give accurate information to Canadians.

Now, 10 years after the Liberals promised transformational, generational public expenditure to boost productivity but delivered the lowest per capita growth in the G7 and the OECD, they have tabled a budget promising the same broken promises recycled from 2015.

Let there be no misunderstanding. This is a credit card budget. The Liberals have tabled a budget, the first in nearly two years, that sets a new non-pandemic record of \$78 billion in deficit expenditure. That is double the size of the deficit that triggered the resignation of the member for University—Rosedale when she was the finance minister. Do members remember that? Do members remember chaos this time last year and the consternation and hand-wringing over Trudeau's \$42-billion deficit?

I will point out that I intend to split my time with the member for Hamilton East—Stoney Creek.

Let us remember the 2025 election, when the Prime Minister promised Canadians that he was the guy who was going to rein in public spending. The deficit in this budget is the equivalent of adding \$5,300 of new debt to every Canadian family. What do Canadians get for this staggering new debt that every Canadian knows they have to pay off with interest? Is there any new money in this budget to pay for the so-called generational investments that the government keeps talking about? The answer is no.

This act we are debating does not contain money for transformational new productivity-improving spending. It simply grows the size of government. The Liberals keep saying that they are going to reduce spending on the operations of government in order to spend more on capital projects. This budget says these words, but this act does not do these things.

The main way the government plans to fulfill its unbelievable claims about its investments is through accounting trickery. Some might ask what is wrong with that if it helps Canadians differentiate between the administration of government and capital costs. What is wrong is that the Liberals' definition is grossly misleading. The PBO says it is “overly expansive”.

Government Orders

What is wrong with it is they are deliberately trying to trick Canadians into thinking the government is building infrastructure when it is actually hiring bureaucrats or connected insiders with consulting contracts or is dispensing corporate welfare and calling it capital investment. What is wrong is that the Liberals are not following internationally recognized definitions. What is wrong is that the government, which has done so much over the last 10 years to compromise its fiscal credibility, is now resorting to accounting trickery to try to fool Canadians and the finance community.

Ten years ago the budget was balanced, homes were relatively affordable in Canada, outside of Vancouver at least, and Canada's middle class was doing all right, much better than in its peer countries. Over the last 10 years, though, Canada alone among G7 countries and alone among members of the OECD, with the exception of Luxembourg, has had no increase in per capita GDP, none. That means that in Canada, we have been left behind by our peer countries.

The value of everything produced in Canada divided by all the people in Canada is now the same as it was 10 years ago, but during that time, the cost of food has gone up, the cost of housing has doubled and the cost of rent has doubled. The cost of living has shot up while Canadians' productivity has not, and as the Bank of Canada told the finance committee earlier this month, the productivity crisis and the cost of living crisis are the same thing. Canadians increasingly cannot afford to live because the government keeps growing, choking out consumers and absorbing more taxes while creating laws that chase investment out of Canada, leaving workers less productive than in the rest of the developed world.

The government spent 10 years passing anti-business laws that have left Canadians with fewer and fewer jobs in Canada's most productive industries. One full year ago, before the tariff war, the senior deputy governor of the Bank of Canada called this a break glass emergency. She talked about how excessive regulation drives out investment from Canada's number one industry, which is the energy industry. Energy is by far Canada's biggest and most valuable export, and the government spent 10 years trying to regulate it into the ground.

There is nothing in this bill that would deal with the root cause of Canada's productivity emergency. There is a lot of talk about major projects, but when the Liberals talk about major projects, the government acts like it is having an out-of-body experience and has no idea who has been in charge of the government for the last 10 years and who introduced Bill C-69, Bill C-48, the carbon tax, the emission cap and a host of other major and minor acts that have chased \$606 billion out of Canada to the United States, even before Trump was inaugurated.

For a moment, let us set aside the government's mismanagement of the Canadian economy, the fiscal deterioration of the national balance sheet that it is presiding over and the cost of living crisis that has been triggered by the government's overspending, and let us talk about fiscal anchors.

On a boat, an anchor is used to hold the boat in place. If we cut the line that connects the boat to the anchor, the boat drifts aimlessly until it runs aground somewhere. If the government were a sailor, it would be the kind of sailor who brings a new anchor on board the

boat, a shiny new piece of equipment that it shows off to everybody, and then throws the anchor overboard without attaching it to a line that connects it to the boat. That is exactly what the government does, and it wonders why it is adrift. Fiscal anchors mean nothing if they are not attached to anything.

The government was literally only a few weeks old in 2015 when it broke its promise of a limited deficit. The Liberals pretended that it never made any such promise and replaced their 2015 election promise with their first so-called fiscal anchor at the time, which was that Canada's debt-to-GDP ratio would never go down. They said it hundreds of times in this chamber.

At the end of 2019, they cut that anchor, brought in a new one and said that their new anchor was our AAA credit rating. Then Fitch Ratings downgraded Canada to AA+, and in the COVID recovery, the Liberals came up with a guardrail, which was a maximum deficit. They blew through that and then went back to claiming that a declining debt-to-GDP ratio was their fiscal anchor.

This budget would cut loose all of the Liberals' past fiscal anchors and bring in two new ones: balancing operating spending with revenue by 2028-29, and maintaining a declining deficit-to-GDP ratio. How much credibility does the government deserve with its history of cutting the line on its anchors? Based on history alone, I say none, but the Parliamentary Budget Officer did give the government a 7.5% chance of maintaining the anchor of a declining deficit-to-GDP ratio. That is getting close to 20:1, if the PBO is giving betting odds on the government's keeping this anchor. These anchors mean nothing when the government's operating budget relies on accounting trickery as well.

This budget would add \$80 billion to the national debt at a time when interest is choking out all other expenses. That is unsustainable and unaffordable and the government is unbelievable.

• (1010)

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, what is unbelievable is the attitude the Conservative Party has with respect to not wanting to invest in Canadians and indeed in Canada.

The member made reference in his speech to DND and military spending. Does he not realize that the leader of the Conservative Party sat around a caucus that left it at 1% of GDP? This budget would have 2%. How dare the member have any gumption at all to be critical of the Prime Minister.

We have a Prime Minister who is travelling the world in order to solidify markets for Canadians and for businesses. In fact, in the United Arab Emirates, we are talking about hundreds of millions of dollars in potential investments for megaprojects. Does the Conservative Party support expanding our economy beyond the U.S. border?

Pat Kelly: Mr. Speaker, of course I support that objective. The problem is that the government has no credibility on executing any of the things it promises.

The government has been in charge for 10 years, and we have no significant upgrades on military equipment. The Prime Minister travels all over the world, and every time he goes somewhere, a week or two later the country he has been to imposes a new tariff. There is no credibility, no execution and no follow-through from the government.

[*Translation*]

Alexis Deschênes (Gaspésie—Les Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Lis-tuguj, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague. I share some of his views, particularly with regard to the government's lack of rigour in presenting this budget, which really involves some creative accounting. Every member who stands up is telling the government that the way it is presenting the numbers makes no sense.

I have a question for my colleague about fiscal restraint. The deficit is very high. We are dismayed by it too. It is \$78 billion. When it comes to the sound management of public funds, would it not have been a good idea for the government to cut subsidies to the oil industry?

The government is giving some \$10 billion per year to an industry that pollutes and that is contributing to the acceleration of global warming. More importantly, this industry is very profitable and has absolutely no need of public funds.

• (1015)

[*English*]

Pat Kelly: Mr. Speaker, I mentioned the energy industry, and I support that industry as an economic driver of this country. I am appalled by the approach of the government to the industry. The government's approach has been to regulate it into the ground. All the energy industry needs is for the government to get off its back and allow private investment to return in order to employ Canadians in the highest-paying and most productive jobs the Canadian economy offers.

Sandra Cobena (Newmarket—Aurora, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have a question on the credibility of the budget and the Prime Minister, which is what the Liberals like to talk about. There is a \$100-billion procurement of submarines that the Prime Minister and the Liberal government forgot to include in the budget. What does that do to credibility?

We have heard the Parliamentary Budget Officer talk about a 7.5% chance of the government keeping its promises on its fiscal anchors, fiscal anchors that it invented after abandoning the fiscal anchors that have governed our country for the last 30 years. Can the member please comment on that?

Pat Kelly: Mr. Speaker, the Parliamentary Budget Officer spared nothing in pointing out how terrible and how low the credibility of the government is. There is a 92.5% chance the Liberals are not going to sustain their anchor, so their anchors mean nothing and they have no credibility.

The member is absolutely right. The Liberals, including a moment ago with the member for Winnipeg North, claim that their

Government Orders

budget contains generational expenditures on military procurement, yet it is not in the budget. They talk about procuring submarines without doing so. I do not even have time to get into the debacles of procurement for the armed forces under the government, but the barracks are crumbling, there is only a handful of tanks and we do not produce enough munitions. We do not produce enough of any of the things we need. Procurement is a disaster.

Ned Kuruc (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address the government's budget 2025 and its implementation plan, Bill C-15.

We have heard this story before about generational investments, Liberal investments, leading to growth. We have heard this story because Justin Trudeau made the same promises 10 years ago. Budget 2025 is just more missed priorities, dangerous gambles and a complete disregard for the long-term finances of Canada.

For an entire decade, Canadians have been told to just wait, to wait for results and affordability. Instead of results, they have watched their paycheques shrink, their mortgages rise and their cost of living explode, all while the government continues to pat itself on the back for programs that have not delivered for Canadians.

Canadians watching this at home deserve clarity, so I will focus on three failures of the Liberal budget. First, the government plans to have endless deficits while printing money to bring back economic investment and growth for Canadians despite the Parliamentary Budget Officer's warning of even higher deficits ahead. Second, the budget mortgages the future of our youth, forcing them to pay tomorrow for today's mistakes. Finally, there is an explosion of bureaucracy and new agencies that spend even more taxpayer money without delivering results.

First, I will start with how printing money and running massive deficits is not an economic plan. For 10 years now, Liberals have insisted that deficits pay for themselves. The facts are clear: That has not worked.

The Parliamentary Budget Officer, the independent fiscal watchdog, has made it extremely clear: The budget's deficits will average \$65 billion over the next four years, up dramatically from last year. The federal debt-to-GDP ratio is no longer on a declining track despite the government's repeated promises. As well, interest payments, money that delivers zero services to Canadians, are projected to rise to over 11% of revenues by the end of the decade.

The Prime Minister is supposed to be a great economist, but this is not fiscal management; this is a fiscal failure. What is the Liberal government's response? It is to have more spending and more borrowing. The worst part is the clever accounting tricks Liberals have played to distract Canadians from their disastrous spending.

Government Orders

According to the Parliamentary Budget Officer, by trying to separate operational spending from capital investments, the Liberals have expanded the definition so far that they have included about 94 billion dollars' worth of spending that does not actually count as investment. This means that the generational investments that Liberals have been sloganizing are actually 30% lower than advertised. Worse yet, according to the PBO's definition, the day-to-day operating balance after their new budget would still be in a deficit position.

The Liberals continue to act as though they can bend economic reality to their will, as though deficits do not matter, as though inflation cannot rise and as though the PBO is not highlighting their economic sleight of hand. Well, deficits do matter. Debt does matter, and ignoring the warnings of the Parliamentary Budget Officer is not leadership; it is irresponsible and dangerous.

Second, the budget sacrifices and mortgages young Canadians. Every dollar borrowed today must be repaid with interest by the generations that follow us, yet the government continues to destroy young people with higher future taxes, higher interest costs and fewer dollars available for things they actually rely on. When he tabled the budget, the Minister of Finance said, "To the youth, this budget was made for you". How exactly does forcing young people to pay for government deficits and soaring debt help them? The budget does nothing for the youth today, but they will be forced to pay off all the government's overspending tomorrow. Young people between the ages of 15 and 24, who are just graduating, are facing the highest unemployment rate the country has seen in decades.

According to an article, an economic policy professor from the University of Toronto said that we are "teetering on the edge of a recession", which will "have a disproportionate impact on young people." The youth are usually the first and hardest hit when economic conditions are weak. Beyond the job market, young Canadians are trying to enter a housing market that is completely out of reach.

- (1020)

Youth are watching their friends move back home, delaying starting families or leaving the country altogether to search for opportunity. They are not choosing these things but being pushed into them by government policies that have made life unaffordable. Today's youth are already facing a housing crisis, an impossible-to-enter job market and high living costs. Now the Liberals are saying not to worry; on top of all that, they get to pay for the Liberals' overspending for decades to come.

Conservatives refuse to accept that. We believe the government should leave the next generation stronger, not burdened under a weight they did not choose.

Third, the budget explodes bureaucracy instead of producing results. The cost of the federal bureaucracy has increased by 80% since 2015, growing by \$6 billion just last year. Canadians are not asking for more agencies or more layers of red tape; they are asking for results that actually make their lives better.

What does budget 2025 deliver to solve the issues concerning Canadians? It doubles bureaucracies to do the jobs of already existing agencies. We can take Build Canada Homes as an example. It

was created to work with other sectors and departments to make housing more available and affordable. There is one problem, which is that this already exists. We already have the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation, which has programs to finance affordable housing and was already tasked with overseeing the national housing strategy. Instead of fixing its failures, the government simply creates new agencies to hide old problems. It is duplication dressed up as innovation.

At the public accounts committee, which I sit on, we have received report after report from the Auditor General that have all been damning. The common thread in all of them is that we have too much bureaucracy and government overspending and not enough accountability. In all these reports, we see spending shooting way over the budgets that have been set out. We see no system of accountability, no progress tracking and no real consequences for poor management. The government promises results but delivers bloated bureaucracy.

The budget promises to bring federal spending down, but the costly budget will keep federal program spending at 15.3% of GDP. This is still higher than prepandemic levels. The government spends 55% of its operating budget on staffing and twice as much on outside consultants.

The PBO has already pointed out that a lot of what the Liberals call capital investments is actually reoccurring program spending, or ongoing operating costs disguised as long-term investment. This is not transparency; it is not accountability, and it is certainly not value for money. We have seen this before. The government creates a new agency to solve a problem, and the agency demands more staff, more funding and more time. Years later, the problem is still there, but the bureaucracy is bigger and more bloated.

Canadians deserve a government that focuses on results. We have heard from the Liberals that global conditions require higher deficits, that investment demands patience and that one more agency is the solution to the problem, but Conservatives believe in something better. We believe in spending discipline, not deficit addiction; we believe in empowering our youth and setting them up to become the future of this great country, and we believe that government should measure success by outcomes and not by how much tax money it burns through.

The choice before the House is simple: a government that treats the national credit card like an unlimited resource or a government that recognizes its responsibility to future generations. The budget fails on fiscal responsibility. It fails on the next generation. It fails on accountability and results.

Government Orders

The Parliamentary Budget Officer has raised the alarm. Young Canadians are already paying the price, but the Prime Minister wants to make the bill bigger. The government's answer is to simply spend more. Conservatives reject that approach. We believe in restoring fiscal anchors; we believe in protecting the next generation, not mortgaging them, and we believe in a government that delivers real results and not bigger bureaucracy.

• (1025)

Aslam Rana (Hamilton Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member for Hamilton East—Stoney Creek gave a beautiful speech.

The word “steel” is mentioned 36 times in budget 2025. There are also big projects, such as \$25 million for the YMCA, a project in the city the member represents. There is a lot for Hamilton in particular in the budget, and for all Canadians in general, so I ask the member of the opposition, why is he still not happy with the budget?

Ned Kuruc: Mr. Speaker, YMCA spending is about \$25 million. The budget is \$78.3 billion. This is just a small piece. We have to focus on the big picture. At the end of the day, printing more money is not a fiscally good idea.

One has to ask oneself this: Is the current Prime Minister working for Canadians, the bank or Brookfield?

[*Translation*]

Alexis Deschênes (Gaspésie—Les Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Lestiguj, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I would like my colleague to share his opinion on the following issue with the House. The deficit is very high. The government could have increased its revenues with the digital services tax. Recently, there have been job losses at one of Quebec's largest private broadcasters, TVA. The government could have not only generated revenue with this digital services tax, but also invested in our culture and protected our media outlets, which are ultimately the architects of our democratic space, where we can stand up to web giants. Instead, the government decided to eliminate this tax.

What does my colleague think about that?

[*English*]

Ned Kuruc: Mr. Speaker, the government has driven a lot of jobs out of this country, including the ones the member mentioned.

I believe the government is not focused on results. It is focused on headlines and focused on selling Canadians big promises. I have said this since the day I got here six months ago. The Liberal government has been focused on winning, not governing the country. We are all waiting for a government that delivers results, not just headlines, and that does not mislead Canadians to push us into the next election to try to hold power.

• (1030)

Tamara Jansen (Cloverdale—Langley City, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the credit rating organization Fitch Ratings has warned again that the government consistently underestimates its deficits. If the government cannot even hit its own numbers, why should anyone believe the promises we have heard? Would you say this budget is based on math or marketing?

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater): Direct questions through the Chair.

The hon. member for Hamilton East—Stoney Creek.

Ned Kuruc: Mr. Speaker, we have seen time and time again that the government does not listen to experts and does not listen to Canadians. The fact of the matter is that every time we debate during question period, the Liberals snicker and laugh on the other side when we bring up real testimony from Canadians and expert witnesses.

I think the Prime Minister thinks he is smarter than everybody and smarter than Canadians. We see him time and time again talking down to members in the House and Canadians.

Is anyone on that side, even in the front bench, actually listening to Canadians?

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am going to assure the member opposite that every member of the Liberal caucus is listening to Canadians. That is why we have substantial legislation before the House. Unfortunately, the Conservatives continue to filibuster, preventing good legislation from ultimately passing.

We have a Prime Minister who is travelling the world to secure future markets for our businesses and Canadians. I wonder if the member can provide his personal opinion as to whether he believes that having the Prime Minister go abroad and secure markets is a good thing for Canada.

Ned Kuruc: Mr. Speaker, what the member just said was misleading. The fact is, we have put motions and bills forward, which have all been rejected by that side of the House, to help Canadians.

As far as the Prime Minister flying around goes, all I can see is that he is collecting Air Miles or Aeroplan points. We have no results from all this travel. It is time he comes back to the House and gives results to Canadians.

[*Translation*]

Steve Lavoie (Beauport—Limoilou, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I will be sharing my time with the member for Yukon.

I am pleased to rise today to proudly represent the people of Beauport—Limoilou. It is the proudest and most beautiful riding in Canada. Representing it is the greatest honour I have ever been given. The people of Beauport—Limoilou are young families, workers and seniors who believe that we need strong leadership to build, protect and strengthen our country.

Government Orders

The budget we put forward is a true investment budget. It is a generational budget. I want to make a real connection between investments and expenses in a way that relates to Canadians' everyday life. Managing Canada's economy is a bit like managing a household. Expenses are the immediate needs, like groceries, clothing for the children and gas. Although this spending is essential, it does not build anything for the future. It just gets us through the week.

Investments help us prepare for the future. Investments include fixing the roof to avoid damage, insulating the house to lower the electricity bills, putting money aside for the children's education or putting money in a registered retirement savings plan to prepare for retirement. It may cost money today, but it protects us, it helps us grow and, above all, it will pay off tomorrow.

What does this mean for Beauport—Limoilou? It means modernizing our infrastructure, building more housing for our families, supporting our local businesses and protecting our communities. In other words, we are not just painting the walls. We are strengthening the foundations of Canada and of Beauport—Limoilou.

This budget is very forward-thinking. It prepares for the future of our children, our families and our communities. It is based on three essential pillars: building, protecting and empowering. These national priorities have a direct and concrete impact on Beauport—Limoilou, which is a dynamic, industrial and community-oriented riding that is firmly focused on the future.

In Beauport—Limoilou, building is not an abstract idea. It is a daily reality. Building means supporting infrastructure projects that bolster our regional economy in a riding where the movement of goods, the creation of industrial jobs and urban development are woven into our economic fabric. The budget supports the modernization of our critical infrastructure.

Building also means addressing the housing challenge in neighbourhoods such as Limoilou, Maizerets, Giffard and Beauport-Ouest. Our investments will make it possible to build more affordable housing, accelerate the construction of new projects and support municipalities that want to increase the housing supply for families and workers.

Building also means supporting our businesses, from small and medium-sized manufacturers in Beauport to innovative businesses in Limoilou, to help them modernize their equipment, increase their productivity and create good jobs right here at home.

This budget provides concrete fiscal tools to encourage investment, innovation and growth.

We also need to protect our communities. This is essential in Beauport—Limoilou, where we have dense urban areas, industrial zones and stunning natural heritage.

Protecting means including measures in the budget that will help municipalities and local organizations better prepare and protect their infrastructure and respond appropriately when needed.

Protecting also means keeping our neighbourhoods safe and improving our residents' quality of life. Federal investments in public safety and border services help maintain a safe environment for families, workers and local businesses.

Finally, protecting means preserving our way of life, whether it be the vitality of Vieux-Limoilou, the tranquility of the Beauport neighbourhoods or the easy access to the natural, communal spaces that make my riding unique.

Empowering means creating the conditions for success. In Beauport—Limoilou, the needs and ambitions are clear.

Empowering means offering our young people more opportunities for employment, internships and training. It means supporting organizations such as Patro Roc-Amadour, work readiness programs such as the Premières-Seigneuries CFER, Urbainculteurs, La Tomate Joyeuse and many others that teach our young people useful skills, help them gain independence and send them on to solid careers.

Empowering also means improving the lives of families, whether through access to housing, reliable public services or a more affordable cost of living. Thanks to this budget, more families in Limoilou and Beauport will have access to meaningful support.

● (1035)

Empowering also means equipping workers and businesses in the riding to adapt and thrive in a changing economy. Our investments will help our local industries, from manufacturers to service companies, innovate, train up and stay competitive. Faced with the challenges of our time, Canadians are not prepared to simply go along with whatever the future holds; they want to build the future themselves. This budget gives them the means to do just that.

We are building the infrastructure, the housing and the industries of tomorrow. We are protecting our communities, our environment and our way of life. We are empowering people in Beauport—Limoilou and across the country with stronger skills and more opportunities. Yes, we are making generational investments for a strong Canada, a Canada that moves forward ambitiously, confidently and with determination. Why are we making all these investments? We are doing it because the world has changed, because yesterday's world is gone.

In my last speech, I alluded to a great bestselling book that was translated into 40 languages and sold 30 million copies. Spencer Johnson's *Who Moved My Cheese* is a simple little book, 100 pages long, that aptly illustrates what our economy is going through today. For years, we knew where our cheese was, thanks to economic stability, secure jobs, reliable supply chains and what seemed like lasting prosperity.

A few pages in, we realize that the cheese represents what we are all looking for: security, stability, opportunities and quality of life. In politics, this cheese takes the form of accessible housing, a reasonable cost of living, modern infrastructure, a healthy environment and sound economic development. The maze symbolizes our environment, our laws, our institutions, economic challenges, the expectations of our constituents, unforeseen crises and rapidly changing realities. Like the characters in the book, constituents and decision-makers have to deal with an environment where yesterday's certainties no longer hold.

Government Orders

In politics, expectations change because of family priorities, demographic structures, the global economy, the labour market, the climate reality, the cost of housing, mobility and various other factors. In Beauport—Limoilou, this translates into constant, growing pressure on housing, a desire to better balance mobility, the environment and economic development, sustained demand for more accessible public services and a need to modernize infrastructure.

True leadership means anticipating what is coming and foreseeing change. Political leadership in a riding like Beauport—Limoilou means supporting economic innovation, modernizing infrastructure, defending ambitious policies, representing the community in challenging times and reaching out to citizens rather than waiting for problems to erupt. Deciding to act even when there is uncertainty is what paves the way for success and achievement. Political leadership means inspiring people not to be afraid of change. In politics, fear of change sometimes hinders the modernization of public policies, working methods and approaches to issues such as housing, mobility, the economy and security.

Modern leadership means acknowledging that change is real, but that we will tackle it together with clarity and ambition. The world has changed, and since yesterday's world no longer exists, the current budget reflects the new reality. For Beauport—Limoilou, this means that families are looking for housing they can afford, young people want exciting opportunities for the future, businesses need a more competitive environment, people want to reconcile economic development and quality of life, and the community wants a representative who is present, willing to listen and engaged. A leader's role is to guide the way towards a stronger economy, more efficient public services and a more stable future. We can no longer govern the way we used to. The world is changing, and the role of a member of Parliament is to help their constituents navigate the labyrinth of life with confidence, vision and honesty. Change is not a threat. Rather, it is an opportunity to build something better.

In Beauport—Limoilou, as in other parts of Canada, these measures will result in jobs, opportunities and a better quality of life. This is a confidence-building budget that represents real progress. It plans for the Canada of tomorrow while responding to today's needs. We are choosing to take action, which means accepting reality, anticipating change and charting new paths to growth.

The generational budget that was passed here in the House serves the interests of all Canadians. I look forward to taking part in its implementation, because I am confident in the future and I believe that this budget will make Canada stronger and more sovereign.

• (1040)

Marilyn Gladu (Sarnia—Lambton—Bkejwanong, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the budget does not include very many measures for seniors or young people. Does my colleague know that Canadians are struggling because of the affordability crisis? What is the government going to do about that?

Steve Lavoie: Mr. Speaker, I would invite my colleague to take a look at the budget. It does talk about seniors and young people.

For young people, there is the GST rebate for first-time homebuyers. That helps our young families. For seniors, there is the Canadian dental care plan. Both my parents needed that money to replace their dentures. I am sorry to mention that here in the House,

but this measure really helped them. They were talking about it for six months because it was such a big deal. That is what we are doing for our young people and seniors.

The Breakfast Club is also receiving funding. This is a generational budget that prepares for our children's future because we are investing. As I said at the beginning of my speech, there are expenses, and then there are investments. Investments pay off later, for future generations, the young people of today.

Alexis Deschênes (Gaspésie—Les Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Lestiguj, BQ): Mr. Speaker, on Monday, I spent time with 60 seasonal workers in Grande-Rivière, in my riding in the Gaspé region. Together, we realized that this budget does not say anything about EI reform. There is, however, an increase in the number of weeks for long-tenured workers. That is nice for them. They might be able to make it to the end of the year.

However, in my riding, people are seasonal workers. It is not their fault. It is the nature of the work that is seasonal, not the workers. These people experience the EI spring gap year after year. They work from morning to night, cracking crab, facing insecurity and uncertainty, wondering if they will have enough employment insurance benefits to make it to the next season.

Can my colleague listen to my heartfelt appeal and work with me to convince this government to finally address this injustice and ensure that seasonal workers in the Gaspé region and elsewhere finally get an EI system that works for them?

• (1045)

Steve Lavoie: Mr. Speaker, I myself am originally from the Lower St. Lawrence region. This budget sets out significant investments to help businesses modernize and retain their workers, and to enable workers to retrain if necessary.

My colleague is making a heartfelt appeal, but I am certain that there are people from the Magdalen Islands who would have liked their MP to vote in favour of the budget in order to move forward with work on their airport. This is something they have been asking for for a long time. It is important to be consistent.

Yes, we will be there for workers, but we must also be there for businesses so that they can retain their employees in the long term and offer good long-term jobs.

Natilien Joseph (Longueuil—Saint-Hubert, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I congratulate my colleague on his speech.

Could my colleague remind the opposition of the fundamental difference between an expense and an investment, since there seems to be some confusion over that?

Steve Lavoie: Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his very important question.

Government Orders

The difference between an expense and an investment seems clear-cut. Some of our colleagues find this strange and say that these are not investment expenses.

For a family in Beauport—Limoilou, the difference is important. It means choosing to buy a less expensive car or a used car in order to set aside enough money to fix the roof and prevent damage. It means contributing to their children's RESP or investing in RRSPs for the future. Every day, families choose between spending money and investing in their children's future.

Every family in Beauport—Limoilou clearly understands this distinction. Sadly, some people are scoffing at the term “investment expense”. They say that these are just expenses, not investment expenses. Well, we know the difference, and so do the families and the people of Beauport—Limoilou.

[*English*]

Brendan Hanley (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Northern and Arctic Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am thankful for the opportunity to rise today to speak to the 2025 budget implementation act.

It is no secret that we are facing a rapidly changing and increasingly uncertain world. In the face of global disruption and uncertainty, Canada's new government is focused on what we can control. This is our plan to transform our economy from one that is reliant on a single trade partner to one that is stronger, more self-sufficient and more resilient to global shocks.

This is a time to invest, especially in the north. Our plan builds on our strengths and delivers investments to build, protect and empower Canada. When I was at home in the Yukon last week, I heard from many people what this budget means for them. We see the north reflected in it, from investments in housing, infrastructure and health care to defending and securing the Arctic and to the critical minerals that will power Canada's clean economy. When we invest in the north, we strengthen all of Canada.

Budget 2025 delivers a bold plan to tackle Canada's housing challenges and strengthen Canada's communities across the country. At the heart of this plan is Build Canada Homes to build affordable housing at scale and to catalyze a new housing industry. We will leverage public lands, offer flexible financial incentives, attract private capital and support manufacturers to deliver.

Included in the budget, importantly, is \$2.8 billion for urban, rural and northern indigenous housing. Here we will work with first nations, Inuit and Métis partners to ensure rapid and effective delivery and to coordinate a cross-government indigenous housing strategy.

We will also launch the build community strong fund, with \$51 billion to support housing-enabled infrastructure, health facilities and community projects. This fund will include a community stream, a direct delivery stream to address climate adaptation, and a provincial and territorial stream for housing, health and education infrastructure.

The budget details the critical minerals sovereign fund, which will make strategic investments in critical minerals projects and companies, including equity investments, loan guarantees and off-

take agreements. The budget also allows for additional critical minerals to be eligible for the critical mineral exploration tax credit through an expansion of the program.

Budget 2025 also introduces the first and last mile fund to support critical minerals projects and supply chains. This fund will incorporate the critical minerals infrastructure fund with the goal of getting near-term critical mineral projects into production and supporting the necessary clean energy and transportation infrastructure.

I was at the Geoscience forum in the Yukon last week. The buzz at the conference was palpable, with positive news both from these budget features and from confidence in the Yukon's energy future expressed by referring the Yukon grid intertie project to the Major Projects Office. I believe at this time, as the mining industry continues to mature and grow, and as an unstable world demands ethical and responsible sources of minerals, that we will have a story to tell in the Yukon, and a rich, productive and sustainable future in this sector.

Many people across the country know too well that our health care challenges are especially acute in the north, and I was proud to see a comprehensive assessment of health care and health care infrastructure needs in northern and Arctic communities. The goal is clear: Identify innovative ways to increase access to care and reduce costly medical travel, working in partnership with the north.

This is in addition to the \$5 billion dedicated to the new health infrastructure fund. This will help provinces and territories modernize hospitals and health facilities, a need we know is deeply felt across the country, especially in our communities in the north. Health agreements with provinces and territories will remain strong, with a focus on home and community care, as well as on mental health and addiction services.

To strengthen our health workforce, budget 2025 introduces a foreign credential recognition action fund, with \$97 million in new support. This will help internationally trained professionals put their skills to work faster, especially in health care, where every qualified worker makes a difference. To support people already working on the front lines, we are proposing a temporary personal support workers tax credit, providing up to \$1,100 per year for eligible workers.

Health care also depends on innovation, and we are setting new targets at 2% growth for Canada's research councils: the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council, the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council and the Canadian Institutes of Health Research. These investments safeguard the councils' vital role in driving discovery, improving competitiveness and building the economy of the future. We are also launching the international talent attraction strategy to bring top-tier researchers to Canadian universities.

● (1050)

Build Canada strong is the right theme for our times. I say this because our new government is focused on exactly that: building Canada, community by community and family by family. This means investments we can feel in our daily lives: affordable housing, skilled trades training, and programs like the Canada strong pass. These measures are not abstract; they are about giving Canadians confidence in their future and pride in their country.

Budget 2025 invests \$1.5 billion to help young Canadians find and keep jobs, including expanding Canada summer jobs and strengthening the youth employment and skills strategy, as well as launching a new youth climate corps to train young people for paid roles in climate resilience and emergency response.

Budget 2025 lowers barriers for Canadians through a supplemental Canada disability benefit, and we are providing \$660.5 million over five years in ongoing funding for the Department for Women and Gender Equality, ensuring sustained progress toward equality and safety for women, girls and 2SLGBTQI+ people.

Budget 2025 also protects consumers. We will publish draft regulations by spring 2026 to prohibit investment and registered account transfer fees currently costing Canadians about \$150 per account. We will require timely transfers and clear information for consumers, explore improving transparency on cross-border transfer fees and foreign exchange costs, and work with banks to simplify switching primary chequing accounts. The Financial Consumer Agency of Canada has been asked to report on the structure and transparency of bank fees.

We are also strengthening Canadian culture and connectivity. Budget 2025 provides \$150 million to CBC/Radio-Canada to reinforce its mandate to serve Canadians and reflect their needs. We will explore modernizing its mandate to strengthen independence, and we are working with CBC/Radio-Canada on new opportunities.

In addition, to make life more affordable and connected, budget 2025 renews the Canada strong pass with \$116.3 million over two years, covering reduced-cost travel for the holiday season and summer 2026 through partners like Via Rail.

Finally, we are investing in communities and equality. Budget 2025 launches the build communities strong fund, with \$51 billion over 10 years plus \$3 billion per year ongoing to support local infrastructure projects that help communities grow and thrive. We are also providing \$660 million in ongoing funding for the Department of Women and Gender Equality, as I mentioned.

Canada's security begins in the north. Budget 2025 makes the largest defence investment in a generation, because sovereignty is

Government Orders

not optional. We are strengthening our Arctic capabilities and making sure our armed forces have the right tools, training and support they need. Defence spending is not just about protection; it is all about partnership, jobs and innovation that benefit the north as well as all of Canada.

Budget 2025 commits \$81.8 billion over five years to give the Canadian Armed Forces the tools and support it needs to meet today's threats. This includes \$20.4 billion to recruit and retain a strong fighting force with generational pay raises and improved health care, \$19 billion to repair and sustain capabilities and invest in defence infrastructure, and \$17.9 billion to expand Canada's military capabilities.

However, these investments are not just about defence; they are also about building infrastructure that serves Canadians. Ports, airstrips and all-season roads in the north will have dual-use benefits, strengthening sovereignty while connecting communities and supporting economic growth. We are also investing \$6.6 billion to strengthen Canada's defence industry through a new defence industrial strategy.

Budget 2025 protects our fiscal strength while investing in housing, health care and infrastructure that Yukoners need. It builds opportunity by supporting indigenous housing, expanding Arctic transportation and strengthening the foundation of northern communities. It also empowers the Yukon to lead, recognizing that the north is not on the margins of Canada's story but at the heart of it.

● (1055)

Tamara Jansen (Cloverdale—Langley City, CPC): Mr. Speaker, seniors opened the budget hoping for help, but they got nothing but higher costs, no meaningful tax relief, no help with housing, no fix for the crushing grocery bills, and empty promises about more doctors. After a lifetime of paying into this country, why are seniors once again paying the price for the government's overspending?

Brendan Hanley: Mr. Speaker, this budget is all about affordability and investing in the generations ahead of us.

Statements by Members

One feature I would just like to point out is automatic tax filing for people on lower income who are not currently accessing benefits like the Canada disability benefit. This includes people who will now be able to access benefits they may never have realized they are eligible for.

Aslam Rana (Hamilton Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member has already mentioned lots of projects, especially nationwide ones. Can he emphasize and elaborate more on indigenous projects?

Brendan Hanley: Mr. Speaker, that is a really important question.

I could point out multiple projects, but I think that one of the key aspects is that when we are investing in infrastructure and when we are talking about national building, major projects and projects of national interest, it is all about cultivating indigenous partnership and making sure that we are working in lockstep with indigenous governments, indigenous leaders and indigenous communities.

Ned Kuruc (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the member mentioned the CBC. We know that money is going towards Eurovision, yet you are taking a scalpel to veterans and veterans affairs. What is more important: supporting our veterans or bringing Eurovision to Canada?

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater): Again, members must speak through the Chair.

Brendan Hanley: Mr. Speaker, I am very happy for the support that we are putting in this budget for Canadian culture and Canadian public media, including CBC/Radio-Canada. This is very important for Canadian heritage and Canadian identity, and I know that veterans will fully support it.

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

• (1100)

[English]

JOLINE ROBERTSON

Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, I rise to honour a beautiful young woman who died too young. I learned about her story when I ran into her father right after the Remembrance Day service in Sidney, and he told me about his deep pain from losing Joline.

December 2, almost a week from now, would have been Joline Robertson's 19th birthday. She was diagnosed with a very rare form of cancer when she was only 13. Her whole family loves her so much. She fought so hard. She was not going to give up over the years, the five or six years that girl fought.

Everyone in Campbell River, her hometown, was praying for her, rooting for her. People from as far away as Surrey in a motorcycle club with members from Surrey did everything they could to let her know she was loved.

We do not forget Joline Robertson. We miss her.

HENRY FARM TENNIS CLUB

Maggie Chi (Don Valley North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this past summer, I had the pleasure of visiting the Henry Farm Tennis Club and touring its wonderful facilities. Founded in 1975, the club will be celebrating its 50th anniversary. This past weekend, it closed out another successful season on the courts by serving up its AGM.

I am advising the House of this beloved local club because we know that associations like tennis clubs build a sense of community that promotes both physical and mental health. By building a healthy Canada, we build Canada strong.

I want to take this occasion to recognize the members of the Henry Farm Tennis Club for their strong community spirit, and I acknowledge the team of volunteers for helping youth build confidence and adults stay active. I commend them for bringing people together across generations, one match at a time. It is “love-all” for this community gem.

* * *

FRANCOPHONE COMMUNITY MILESTONES

Carol Anstey (Long Range Mountains, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize important milestones for the francophone community in Newfoundland and Labrador. I was pleased to recently attend the celebration that marked the 52nd annual general meeting of the Fédération des francophones de Terre-Neuve et du Labrador and the 30th anniversary of ARCO, two organizations that continue to strengthen culture, language and community in our province.

For many years, they have organized festivals, creating spaces where families, youth and newcomers can celebrate heritage, build connections and feel a true sense of belonging. I especially want to acknowledge the volunteers who support and drive these organizations. Like so many groups in our province, their programs and events rely on the people who give their time, energy and care.

These volunteers play an important role in keeping francophone life strong and vibrant. I was inspired by their sense of culture, musical talent, pride and community spirit.

I offer warm congratulations on these milestones and best wishes for the years ahead.

* * *

COMMUNITY FUNDING IN HAMILTON CENTRE

Aslam Rana (Hamilton Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight how our government is delivering on our promise to build Canada strong. Through the build communities strong fund in budget 2025, communities like mine, Hamilton Centre, are already seeing real results.

The Hamilton Downtown Family YMCA, a long-standing pillar in our city, will finally receive the critical funding it needs. As the president and CEO of the YMCA, Manny Figueiredo, said, the budget will “help unlock much-needed housing in the heart of Hamilton while creating a modern, inclusive, and sustainable hub that promotes health, connection, and belonging for people of all ages.”

This is what budget 2025 delivers: a real impact for real people. While the opposition is focused on dividing Canadians, we are focused on investing in them and building stronger, safer and more connected communities.

* * *

SASKATCHEWAN'S HOLODOMOR MEMORIAL

Michael Kram (Regina—Wascana, CPC): Mr. Speaker, from 1932 to 1933, millions of Ukrainians perished in the Holodomor, a man-made famine deliberately engineered by Soviet dictator Joseph Stalin. For many years, Saskatchewan's Holodomor memorial stood in Regina's Wascana Park, with the reproduction of the iconic *Bitter Memories of Childhood* statue as its centrepiece. Unfortunately, over time, the Saskatchewan winters took their toll and the memorial fell into disrepair.

Recently, the Provincial Capital Commission, in consultation with the Ukrainian-Canadian Congress's Holodomor construction committee, completed a restoration project of the memorial so that it remains a dignified public reminder of the resilience of the Ukrainian people in Ukraine, Saskatchewan and around the world.

I thank everyone who contributed to the restoration of Saskatchewan's Holodomor memorial. *Slava Ukraini*.

* * *

• (1105)

[Translation]

FORTY-EIGHT-HOUR BIKE CHALLENGE TO END VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

Bienvenu-Olivier Ntumba (Mont-Saint-Bruno—L'Acadie, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge the presence on Parliament Hill of four inspiring women: Amélie Gilbert, Daly Doucet, Florence Vézina and Maxime Fortin.

They recently organized a 48-hour cycling challenge during which they pedalled to raise money for Carrefour pour elle, an organization that works to end violence against women. Through their determination and commitment, they managed to raise over \$5,000 to support this crucial cause. This event was much more than just an athletic challenge. It served to raise awareness and mobilize our communities around a fight that concerns us all.

On behalf of Mont-Saint-Bruno—L'Acadie, I commend them for their commitment.

* * *

NORMAND LAPOINTE

Jason Groleau (Beauce, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is with respect that I pay tribute to Normand Lapointe, who passed away on October 22.

Statements by Members

Mr. Lapointe was the member for Beauce from 1980 to 1984. Here in the House of Commons, he was a committed MP, a bridge between workers and entrepreneurs and the voice of a proud, creative, and entrepreneurial region.

In my early days in politics, Mr. Lapointe personally offered me extraordinary support. Thanks to his generous support and advice, I found the confidence to move forward. I will always be grateful to him.

A community builder, a proud resident of Beauce, a man of great wisdom and a unifier, he believed in practical solutions, dialogue and individual dignity.

To Guylaine, Marlène and Vicky, and his family, friends and all those he inspired, I offer my sincere condolences.

I thank Mr. Lapointe for his example, his kindness and most of all his love for Beauce.

* * *

[English]

SHUAH ROSKIES

Karim Bardeesy (Taiaiko'n—Parkdale—High Park, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honour the legacy of Shuah Roskies, a long-time resident of Taiaiko'n—Parkdale—High Park, who died two years ago and would have turned 50 years old this month.

After a childhood living in New York, Fiji, Israel, Papua New Guinea and Wales, Shuah settled in Toronto in her mid-twenties and trained as a lawyer, focusing on the most neglected in our society: young people in the child welfare system. Shuah worked through the Office of the Children's Lawyer to represent children and teenagers who otherwise had no family and no voice. She later worked at a policy level to bring together advocates from across North America to find new solutions for teen homelessness.

Shuah should have been robustly recognized, but she had little interest in big awards. She cared about and drove positive change for people, the kind of positive change she expected us to deliver in this House.

That Shuah is not with us anymore is another stark reminder that some of the people who care so much for others need care themselves, even when they do not ask for it. She is beloved and remembered by her husband and children, Andrew, Jonah and Mira Sepiell, and by the family members and young adults she touched, because she loved them and Canada so deeply.

*Statements by Members***COST OF FOOD**

Ziad Aboultaif (Edmonton Manning, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberal government is the most expensive in Canadian history. The Liberals do not understand that every dollar the Prime Minister spends comes out of the pockets of Canadians, driving up the cost of everything. Year over year, food costs have increased 3.4% under the Liberals. Canadians are forced to go hungry to keep a roof over their heads.

The Liberals had a chance to lower food costs for Canadians by scrapping the industrial carbon tax, but they chose to make food more expensive by increasing it, driving up the cost of fertilizer and farm equipment. It seems like the government does not care.

Why will the Liberal government not make the common-sense changes needed to make food affordable in Canada again?

* * *

[*Translation*]**VANIER CUP**

Xavier Barsalou-Duval (Pierre-Boucher—Les Patriotes—Verchères, BQ): Mr. Speaker, after winning the Uteck Bowl in a 49 to 19 victory over Saint Mary's University in Halifax on November 15, the Université de Montréal Carabins flew to Regina where they will now take on the University of Saskatchewan Huskies in the Vanier Cup final.

My favourite player on the team is number 44. He is one to watch. His name is Mathieu Barsalou and he is my mother's cousin's son. He plays running back. In the semi-finals, he scored a whopping four touchdowns, which is quite impressive.

Tomorrow, we are counting on the Carabins to keep Quebec on top by bringing the Vanier Cup home to Quebec for the fourth year in a row: 2022, 2023, 2024, and why not 2025?

Go Carabins!

* * *

● (1110)

[*English*]**CANADIAN SOCCER EXCELLENCE**

Yasir Naqvi (Ottawa Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is a good time to be a soccer fan in Ottawa. Ottawa Rapid, the women's soccer team, finished an outstanding first season, finishing second in the league and making it all the way to a heartbreaking penalty shootout in the semifinals against Vancouver.

The very next day, Atlético Ottawa, the men's soccer team, finished its own exceptional season, with the now-famous final of the Canadian Premier League played in the middle of a classic Canadian snowstorm, defeating Calgary 2-1. If members have not yet googled “icicle kick by David Rodriguez”, they will want to check it out. It has gone viral.

Both teams are making our city proud and are helping to put Canadian soccer on the map. Let us hear it for Ottawa Rapid and Atlético Ottawa. Go, Canada!

THE BUDGET

Stephanie Kusie (Calgary Midnapore, CPC): Mr. Speaker, last week, the PBO released his response to the Prime Minister's costly budget, and it painted a grim fiscal picture. His report states, “With Budget 2025 the Government abandoned the previous fiscal anchor to reduce the federal debt-to-GDP ratio over the medium term.” He pointed out that in the 2024 fall economic statement “the Government reiterated its commitment to reducing the federal debt-to-GDP ratio over the medium term, noting that ‘[t]his metric is key not only for fiscal sustainability, but also to preserve Canada’s AAA credit rating’”.

It is no wonder the Prime Minister wants to fire him: The PBO keeps telling the truth. However, the government will continue to try to discredit those who attempt to tell the truth to Canadians about who the Liberals are and the damage they have done to Canada.

My Conservative colleagues and I will never stop fighting for Canada, forcing those who claim to serve her to be loyal and defending the nation I love.

* * *

HINDU HERITAGE MONTH

Juanita Nathan (Pickering—Brooklin, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, November marks Hindu Heritage Month, a time to honour one of the world's oldest living traditions and recognize the profound contributions that Hindu Canadians make to our country in the field of medicine, new technologies, education, arts, finance and entrepreneurship.

With nearly one million Hindu Canadians enriching our social, cultural and economic values, from philanthropists like Ramesh Chotai in Pickering to political leaders like the Minister of Foreign Affairs, the Minister of Public Safety and Liberal Party leader Sachit Mehra, Hindu Canadians continue to shape the present and future of our political landscape.

Canada's strength lies in our ability to learn from one another, celebrate our differences and work together for the common good. I invite my colleagues in the House to participate in the many Hindu Heritage Month events being hosted in their local communities.

I wish a happy Hindu Heritage Month to everyone.

*Statements by Members***PRIME MINISTER OF CANADA**

Hon. Rob Moore (Fundy Royal, CPC): Mr. Speaker, while hard-working Canadians jump through hoops to do things by the book and pay more than their fair share in taxes, Brookfield has been exposed as one of Canada's biggest tax-dodgers. It was recently revealed that the Prime Minister's company has avoided paying more than \$6.5 billion in Canadian taxes over the last five years by funnelling profits through offshore tax havens in Bermuda and the Cayman Islands.

This may come as a shock to Canadians, but it is no surprise to the Prime Minister, who himself had set up three multi-billion dollar investment funds registered offshore while he was chair of Brookfield. Liberals are telling young Canadians to sacrifice more, while the Prime Minister has done everything in his power to sacrifice less. This is the height of hypocrisy.

Canadians deserve a Prime Minister who puts the country first, not his own bank account. Conservatives will always defend hard-working Canadians, and we will hold the Prime Minister accountable for forcing taxpayers to sacrifice more than he is willing to sacrifice himself.

* * *

[Translation]

WORLD MENOPAUSE MONTH

Hon. Mona Fortier (Ottawa—Vanier—Gloucester, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, since October was World Menopause Month, I would like to draw attention to this important issue that affects the health, well-being and financial security of millions of women across the country.

[English]

The conversation about menopause gained real momentum last month. Menopause is a natural life phase that affects the body, the mind and our emotional well-being, yet many women still go through it without realizing their symptoms are linked to it.

According to the Menopause Foundation of Canada, unmanaged symptoms carry an estimated annual cost of \$3.5 billion to the Canadian economy. With women aged 45 to 55 now the fastest-growing segment of the Canadian workforce, supporting them is not just the right thing to do; it strengthens families, workspaces, communities and our economy.

[Translation]

Let us keep up the momentum from October. Let us break the silence so that menopause is no longer minimized or misunderstood, but instead addressed with the education, support and respect women deserve.

* * *

● (1115)

[English]

PRIME MINISTER OF CANADA

Rachael Thomas (Lethbridge, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Canadians thought Justin Trudeau was the jet-setting prime minister, but it turns out the current Prime Minister actually puts him to shame. He

professes to put Canada first, but he loves to leave our country any opportunity he gets. In fact, in the last few short months, he has managed to rack up 28 trips, equivalent to four trips around the globe.

As he enjoys his luxury travel from continent to continent, Canadians are left in the lurch, wondering if he will ever bring home a deal for them. In fact, the tangibles show the exact opposite. His trip to Washington equalled more tariffs. His trip to China equalled more tariffs. His trip to India equalled more tariffs. The more air miles he racks up, the worse things get. This, of course, is as Canadian families are already struggling just to pay their bills.

After photo ops and deals for Brookfield, the only souvenir that the Prime Minister brings home for Canadians is the bill, and he expects families to foot it. That is wrong.

* * *

TERRY MCHALE

James Maloney (Etobicoke—Lakeshore, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, on September 27, the Ottawa Valley lost a giant in Terry McHale. Devoted to his community, he served as a municipal councillor and spent 40 years with the Douglas Fire Department, rising to become fire chief. An entrepreneur, he and his brother Jim owned and operated Bromley Farm Supply, a cornerstone of the local agricultural community.

In addition, together with his love, Evelyn, he owned and operated the famous Douglas Tavern for 49 years. It was not just a community gathering place where everyone was welcomed but also where the McHales hosted celebrations of their Irish heritage and culture, of which Terry was fiercely proud. Generosity ran through his veins. He and Evelyn raised hundreds of thousands of dollars to support the community. He was also a driving force of the Lions Club.

Terry will be forever missed by countless people, most of all by Evelyn, their children, their grandchildren and his extended family. Rest in peace, Terry, and thanks.

*Oral Questions***ORAL QUESTIONS***[English]***INTERNATIONAL TRADE**

Kyle Seeback (Dufferin—Caledon, CPC): Mr. Speaker, in a mere eight months, the globe-trotting Prime Minister has circumnavigated the globe four times. It would not be so bad if he actually delivered some results for Canadians, but every time he meets with a world leader, things get worse. When he met with the Premier of China, China slapped canola tariffs on Canadian farmers. When he met with the Prime Minister of India, India slapped fees on peas. He has met with the U.S. President many times, and tariffs have only gone up. Every time the Prime Minister gets near a plane, Canadian farmers clutch their wallets in panic.

If all his travel results in worse conditions for Canadians, why does he keep doing it?

Hon. Evan Solomon (Minister of Artificial Intelligence and Digital Innovation and Minister responsible for the Federal Economic Development Agency for Southern Ontario, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is very worrying that the opposition seems to exhibit such a fear of flying, but it is even more worrying that they exhibit a fear of building.

The Prime Minister went to the U.A.E. and brought back a \$1-billion deal to build our critical minerals sector and \$70 billion of investment to build our country. That is exactly what we are doing.

It turns out that our plan is an excellent cure for the opposition's fear of building.

Kyle Seeback (Dufferin—Caledon, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister actually got a letter that could maybe deliver \$1 billion someday. Meanwhile, the effect of tariffs on canola is \$4.5 billion a year. The effect of tariffs on peas is \$1 billion a year. We have a \$1-trillion trade arrangement with the United States, and our steel industry, our aluminum industry, our auto sector and our softwood lumber industry are getting absolutely decimated while he flies around and brings back this tiny, paltry deal. It is like bragging about the Blue Jays beating a little league team 15-1.

If the result of all the Prime Minister's travel is only making things worse for Canadians, why not just stay home?

Yasir Naqvi (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Trade and to the Secretary of State (International Development), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canada's a proud trading nation, and the way we have been able to build that proud tradition of trading around the world and build prosperity in this country is by actually going to other parts of the world and building those relationships. That is precisely what the Prime Minister is doing.

In fact, just yesterday, the government of the United Arab Emirates decided to invest \$70 billion in Canada. That is investment in our communities, creating well-paying jobs, and that is just the beginning. That is the work the Prime Minister is doing, and we will continue to do that work.

Carol Anstey (Long Range Mountains, CPC): Mr. Speaker, do members remember “elbows up”? Well, the only thing up right now is the Prime Minister's air miles. He has flown enough kilometres to circle the earth four times, but after all that globetrotting, Cana-

dians still get no deals, no relief, higher tariffs and higher bills. Every time the Prime Minister steps off a private jet, Canadians get hit with another tariff hike. After the U.S., there were higher tariffs. After China, there were new tariffs on seafood and grain.

Why is it that every time the Prime Minister meets foreign leaders, Canadians get stuck paying for his failures through higher tariffs?

● (1120)

Hon. Evan Solomon (Minister of Artificial Intelligence and Digital Innovation and Minister responsible for the Federal Economic Development Agency for Southern Ontario, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives have to learn to take yes for an answer. The Prime Minister was in the U.A.E. and its leadership said yes to Canada, investing \$1 billion in our critical minerals sector, with \$70 billion of investment coming to Canada.

In fact, the Premier of Saskatchewan, Scott Moe, supports this. Scott Moe said, “we welcome Prime Minister Carney's efforts to raise Canada's credibility in the international sphere”.

It is time for the opposition to join us and build Canada.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater): I will remind the hon. minister not to use the proper name of the Prime Minister in the House.

The hon. member for Long Range Mountains.

Carol Anstey (Long Range Mountains, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the hollow letter of intent does not change the facts: The Prime Minister has flown to meet with the Brits in the U.K., a world tour of photo ops and selfies, and Canadians have absolutely nothing to show for it. There have been no wins on tariffs, just more tariffs every single time he travels. He promised his jet-setting diplomacy would help Canadians; all it has done is help his Instagram feed.

Will the Prime Minister finally admit that his international photo op tours are not delivering results, because the only thing going up when he travels is the cost to Canadians?

Yasir Naqvi (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Trade and to the Secretary of State (International Development), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, in mere months since this new government has been elected, we have signed a comprehensive trade agreement with Indonesia. The Prime Minister was just in the United Arab Emirates, and he has signed an agreement to protect our investors so that more investments could be made right here in Canada. In fact, we have launched a new trade agreement with the United Arab Emirates as well.

Here is the result: Just yesterday, the United Arab Emirates decided to invest \$70 billion in our country. That is jobs in all our communities. The Conservatives need to accept these wins, which are building Canada strong.

* * *

[Translation]

THE ECONOMY

Gabriel Hardy (Montmorency—Charlevoix, CPC): Mr. Speaker, every time the Prime Minister travels, Canadians hope that he will come back with results, whether it be lower tariffs, meaningful agreements with immediate effects, or gains for our workers. However, every time he has travelled, whether to the United States, China, or India, the only thing he has brought back is increased tariffs and bigger bills for Canadians.

How come every time the Prime Minister boards a plane, tariffs go up? Has it not occurred to him to stay in the country, lower tariffs and lower gas taxes so that Canadian families can finally afford a good life?

Hon. Evan Solomon (Minister of Artificial Intelligence and Digital Innovation and Minister responsible for the Federal Economic Development Agency for Southern Ontario, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there is a lot of good news here.

The Prime Minister went to the United Arab Emirates.

[English]

The Prime Minister brought back an extraordinary deal: \$1 billion for our critical minerals sector. Let us think about that. There is \$70 billion in investment to build Canadian infrastructure and good jobs here in Canada. That goes along with our plan to build affordable homes and invest in our defence sector.

I do not know why the opposition cannot take “yes” for an answer.

[Translation]

Gabriel Hardy (Montmorency—Charlevoix, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it seems that every time the Prime Minister flies abroad, his Brookfield colleagues are never far behind. In New York City, Brookfield was there. In Seoul and in Singapore, Brookfield was waiting for him. This week in the UAE, Brookfield made a major announcement in the same sectors of activity that the Prime Minister says he wants to negotiate. While these coincidences keep piling up, one thing remains consistent: The tariffs imposed on Canada go up.

Oral Questions

Would the Prime Minister have the decency to send his travel claims to Brookfield? Clearly, Brookfield is the only one benefiting from his trips.

[English]

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is truly amazing. The Conservatives need to refocus their questions.

Quite frankly, when it comes to trade and building Canada strong, we have to look at exports that go beyond the United States. Whether it is with Indonesia, Korea, the Philippines or the United Arab Emirates, the Prime Minister is working hard for Canadians every day to expand trade opportunities. That will mean hundreds of millions of dollars in exports.

That is a positive thing. They should be supporting that instead of asking ridiculous questions today.

* * *

[Translation]

CLIMATE CHANGE

Alexis Deschênes (Gaspésie—Les Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Lis-tuguj, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister loves to travel, yet he snubbed the UN climate change conference in Brazil. He chose not to show his face, meanwhile Canada was being criticized by the entire planet for its environmental backtracking. Canada won the fossil of the day award, a disgrace worthy of the oil monarchies.

Canada was also ranked 61 out of 67 countries for its poor climate performance, proving that just when we think the country has hit rock bottom, it can still sink lower.

Why are the Liberals abandoning the fight against climate change?

• (1125)

Hon. Mona Fortier (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canada remains committed to the Paris Agreement and the goal of net-zero emissions by 2050. Domestically, the Canadian economy has grown while becoming significantly less carbon-intensive thanks to cleaner energy, better technologies and innovation.

Our climate competitiveness strategy builds on this progress and positions Canadian businesses to play a leading role in the global transition to net-zero emissions.

We are moving forward.

Alexis Deschênes (Gaspésie—Les Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Lis-tuguj, BQ): Mr. Speaker, no, they are not making any progress in the fight against climate change.

Oral Questions

While Canada places far down the list of the world's worst performing countries, the Liberals are trying to sink it even lower. At the very moment that Canada was disgraced in front of the whole world at COP30, the Liberals were negotiating with Alberta to build another pipeline for western oil. As if investing \$34 billion of public money in the Trans Mountain pipeline was not enough, they want another one.

When will the Liberals stop pandering to the voracious greed of oil billionaires?

Hon. Mona Fortier (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, as we did this week, Canada continues to play a constructive and collaborative role. The Canadian delegation attended COP30 with its international counterparts, indigenous communities, other levels of government, civil society, labour groups and other stakeholders to ensure that we move forward from commitment to implementation.

We are therefore going to continue advancing toward our Paris Agreement targets and continue building a low-carbon future that is resilient to climate change.

Claude DeBellefeuille (Beauharnois—Salaberry—Soulanges—Huntingdon, BQ): Mr. Speaker, Quebeckers do not want another Liberal pipeline of dirty western oil. We all remember last summer, when we had the worst air quality in the entire world because of the forest fires. Albertans may have forgotten that Jasper burned, but we have not. We have also not forgotten our produce growers who lose crops almost every year because of abnormal weather patterns.

Climate change is already here. Will the Liberals shut down their new pipeline project?

Hon. Mona Fortier (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are investing in major projects. We are also making many investments in budget 2025, including a 15% clean electricity investment tax credit available to Crown corporations like Hydro-Québec, as well as \$17.2 billion over 10 years for housing- and health-related infrastructure, such as hospitals, universities and CEGEPs.

We will continue to build strong communities by investing \$51 billion over 10 years in projects like the Espace Hubert-Reeves in Charlevoix, the shipyard—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater): The hon. member for St. Albert—Sturgeon River.

[English]

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Michael Cooper (St. Albert—Sturgeon River, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister is spinning that he negotiated a great deal with the U.A.E. It is such a great deal that the text is nowhere to be found, no details have been provided, and as far as the so-called investment commitments go, there is no timeline.

I have a simple question: On what date can we expect to see the first dollar of investment from the U.A.E.? I would like just a date, please.

Hon. Wayne Long (Secretary of State (Canada Revenue Agency and Financial Institutions), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this may come as a surprise to a party whose leader has never had a job outside the House, but one actually has to travel the global economy to build relationships to bring investment back to this country.

Our side is focused on building the strongest economy in the G7; the other side continues with the bizarre line of questioning about the Prime Minister's travel. Our Prime Minister is focused on building our country, retooling our economy and making our economy the pride of the G7.

Michael Cooper (St. Albert—Sturgeon River, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I asked for a date. There is no date, but rest assured: The government has secured meetings with the U.A.E. next year. What we have is an agreement to talk about a possible agreement sometime in the future. This is more jet-setting, more photo ops and more press releases, with no tangible results for Canadian workers.

Is this the best we can get from the so-called master negotiator?

• (1130)

Yasir Naqvi (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Trade and to the Secretary of State (International Development), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I think it is a great, great day when we hear that a foreign government is deciding to invest \$70 billion in our economy. We are talking about AI, infrastructure and agriculture to create those jobs. This is about making sure we can leverage its sovereign funds and our pension funds to create opportunities for our economy right here at home.

There are companies like Mila, which is launching a new partnership with the U.A.E.'s Technology Innovation Institute; BlackBerry, which has signed a partnership with the U.A.E.'s Cyber Security Council to strengthen cybersecurity co-operation infrastructure; and Invest in Canada, which is working to partner with the U.A.E. and to identify and explore large-scale investments right—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater): The hon. member for York—Durham.

Jacob Mantle (York—Durham, CPC): Mr. Speaker, when Canadians travel, whether it is a holiday with family or a business trip with colleagues, they come back with good memories and maybe a souvenir or two. When the Prime Minister travels, he comes back with something very different: a hangover of tariffs. When he met with the Chinese, there were more tariffs. When he met with the Indians, there were more tariffs, and when he met with the Americans, again and again, there were more tariffs on steel, autos, aluminum, forestry and more.

How many more trips does the Prime Minister need before he will acknowledge the simple truth that every farmer, factory worker and steelworker in the country knows: His policy is failing them?

Oral Questions

Hon. Evan Solomon (Minister of Artificial Intelligence and Digital Innovation and Minister responsible for the Federal Economic Development Agency for Southern Ontario, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have to wonder what the opposition members will really support. They cannot support a deal to invest \$1 billion in critical minerals from the U.A.E. They cannot support \$70 billion coming in from the U.A.E. Maybe it is just because they want us to be distracted from what they also opposed; on Monday they opposed LNG Canada phase two in British Columbia, the new Darlington nuclear project in Bowmanville, 18,000 construction jobs, and the Red Chris mine expansion in northwest British Columbia.

The real question is, what does the opposition support?

Jacob Mantle (York—Durham, CPC): Mr. Speaker, an agreement for the future is no solution to today's problems. An agreement with the U.A.E. is no agreement when there is no investment. We know that Canadians have moved \$124 billion out of Canada. If Canadians have no faith in the government, why would any foreign investor? More troubling, the real and present danger, is the inability to get a deal on the things that count: steel, aluminum and canola. Canada's chief trade negotiator said today that there are no negotiations ongoing with the U.S.

When will we start negotiations and get a deal?

Hon. John Zerucelli (Secretary of State (Labour), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives voted against the budget. I just want you to know what you voted against. You are cheering for voting against the largest pay increase for the military and a defence spending plan. You voted against the nuclear plant in your riding; a tax cut for 22 million Canadians; a national school food program, which the Conservatives called “garbage”; 1,000 RCMP personnel; and 1,000 border officers. This is what you voted against. When the Conservatives vote against the budget, they vote against Canadian—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater): I will just remind the secretary of state to please address his comments through the Chair.

* * *

FINANCE

Dan Albas (Okanagan Lake West—South Kelowna, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Parliamentary Budget Officer says that the Prime Minister abandoned his own fiscal anchor, the one he claimed was key to preserving Canada's AAA credit rating and keeping borrowing costs low. Fitch warns, “federal finances run a high risk of further deterioration.”

Is the Prime Minister breaking his own fiscal promises because he is incompetent or because he just does not care about Canadians' future?

Leslie Church (Parliamentary Secretary to the Secretaries of State for Labour, for Seniors, and for Children and Youth, and to the Minister of Jobs and Families (Persons with Disabilities), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let us talk about how Canada is one of only a handful of countries around the world that maintain a AAA credit rating. That stamp of approval means that we have not just a strong fiscal position but also an enviable one.

The head of the IMF has said that Canada is acting decisively to use its fiscal space to make the investments that are going to boost our productivity and growth. We are on the right track.

Canada lost its AAA credit rating in the early 1990s, after the party opposite was in power with reckless deficits and ballooning debt.

Dan Albas (Okanagan Lake West—South Kelowna, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am from B.C., and David Eby has taken us off a fiscal cliff simply because the province said the exact same things and was downgraded.

Now Canadians are paying nearly 50% more on their credit cards than in 2015, while the Prime Minister maxes out the taxpayers' credit card. The Parliamentary Budget Office says the government broke its own debt-to-GDP promise, and Fitch is warning of fiscal slippage.

Is the costly credit card budget proof of reckless spending or proof of total economic mismanagement?

• (1135)

Hon. Wayne Long (Secretary of State (Canada Revenue Agency and Financial Institutions), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the member should actually read the report before citing it when he gets up in the House. According to the Parliamentary Budget Officer's report, “current fiscal policy in Budget 2025 would be deemed sustainable over the long term.”

We have the best credit rating in the world. We have the best net debt-to-GDP in the G7. We are going to use that fiscal firepower to build the strongest economy in the G7.

Kurt Holman (London—Fanshawe, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister's costly credit card budget piles today's reckless spending onto tomorrow's taxpayers. After 10 years of Liberal budgets' failing to balance themselves, Canadians now put nearly 50% more of their expenses on credit cards.

Fitch warns that federal finances are at high risk of further deterioration because the government keeps blowing past its own fiscal anchors, and the fiscal watchdog says there is less than a 10% chance the government will keep to its spending promises. It is no wonder the Prime Minister wants to fire him.

Oral Questions

How many more fiscal watchdog reports will it take for the Prime Minister to finally rein in his credit card spending?

Tom Osborne (Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Treasury Board, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, at every opportunity the opposition members had to make life more affordable for Canadians, they failed. They voted against more affordable early learning and child care, against lower taxes and against eliminating the tax on new home purchases. They have failed Canadians at every opportunity.

Where are the common-sense Conservatives? One member is here, and two members are behind the curtains.

* * *

[*Translation*]

FORESTRY INDUSTRY

Marilène Gill (Côte-Nord—Kawawachikamach—Nitassinan, BQ): Mr. Speaker, the news came as a shock: the Arbec mill in Port-Cartier is laying off roughly 100 workers.

The federal government needs to wake up. Forestry industry representatives, including Arbec, were in Ottawa less than a month ago to share their concerns and discuss solutions.

A wage subsidy is needed, precisely to prevent layoffs like those in Port-Cartier. For the sector in general, the federal government must offer 50% of the countervailing and anti-dumping duties to be paid.

How many more layoffs will it take for Ottawa to actually do something?

Claude Guay (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, softwood lumber is the lifeblood of Canada's small forestry communities, which are essential to our country's economy. We have been clear that the tariffs on softwood lumber are absolutely unjustified, and we are working at all levels to resolve the softwood lumber dispute.

We have announced a number of programs, including \$50 million to support employment, \$500 million to make changes and \$700 million to help with cash flow. We are also considering other future measures to support our forestry workers.

Marilène Gill (Côte-Nord—Kawawachikamach—Nitassinan, BQ): Mr. Speaker, we need to take action before industries shut down. Things are bad in the forestry sector, Ottawa knows that, but I do not know if it truly understands.

Yesterday, there were 100 layoffs at Arbec in Port-Cartier. Last week, workers in Amos learned they would be laid off for Christmas. Last June, there were layoffs in Lac-Saint-Jean, Mauricie and elsewhere. After all these job losses, the Liberals still refuse to provide the solutions the industry is calling for. We need wage subsidies and money to compensate for the Americans' illegal tariffs.

Why are the Liberals still waiting?

Claude Guay (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I do not really understand the question from my Bloc colleague, because there are already three programs in place, and I just mentioned that we

are planning new ones. There is a program to support businesses with wages and transformation, and others will follow.

* * *

FINANCE

Bernard Généreux (Côte-du-Sud—Rivière-du-Loup—Kataskomiq—Témiscouata, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister acts as though the public purse is his own personal credit card. The result is that Canadians are falling further into debt and paying more for everything. To make matters worse, the Parliamentary Budget Officer confirmed that the Prime Minister has scrapped the plan to reduce the debt-to-GDP ratio, a crucial commitment if we want to ensure that Canada does not end up having to borrow at a very high price.

How many more warnings will it take before this Prime Minister finally stops spending money like it grows on trees?

[*English*]

Hon. John Zerucelli (Secretary of State (Labour), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the Conservatives voted against budget 2025. They voted against skilled tradespersons. Budget 2025 supports our skilled trades folks with major investments in local infrastructure, clean energy economy projects and expanded training for every worker across the country.

Members should not take just my word for it but also the word of the building trades unions. They said they are thrilled with the budget and the fact that it passed, calling it monumental for skilled workers, with \$50 billion in infrastructure and \$75 million in training. However, they had another thing to say: that those who supported the budget acted in—

● (1140)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater): The hon. member for Côte-du-Sud—Rivière-du-Loup—Kataskomiq—Témiscouata.

[*Translation*]

Bernard Généreux (Côte-du-Sud—Rivière-du-Loup—Kataskomiq—Témiscouata, CPC): Mr. Speaker, my colleague is trying to defend the indefensible, but the facts speak for themselves. Fitch Ratings, which assesses our credit rating, issued a warning, in black and white, that the country's finances run a high risk of further deterioration because of this government's reckless spending.

Rather than spewing more rhetoric, can my colleague explain why this government is completely ignoring the warnings of experts and stubbornly insisting on running Canada's economy into the ground?

Leslie Church (Parliamentary Secretary to the Secretaries of State for Labour, for Seniors, and for Children and Youth, and to the Minister of Jobs and Families (Persons with Disabilities), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, budget 2025 has two fiscal anchors: a debt-to-GDP ratio baseline and balancing operating expenditures over the next three years. Our former Parliamentary Budget Officer, Kevin Page, recently stated that he is comfortable with budget deficits of about 2.5% of the GDP given the current economic context.

Canada is ahead of Germany, Italy, the United Kingdom and France, and that includes the significant investments that we are making in this budget.

[English]

Scott Anderson (Vernon—Lake Country—Monashee, CPC): Mr. Speaker, do members remember when the Liberal government told us the budget would balance itself? For 10 years, the government has promised to spend less, while throwing money in every direction. Having finally blown up the economy, the Liberals' brilliant solution is to spend twice as much but change the name of spending to "investment". Even the PBO, the budget watchdog and Fitch Ratings are pulling their hair out.

How many more fiscal watchdog reports is it going to take for the Prime Minister to rein in his costly credit card spending?

Hon. Wayne Long (Secretary of State (Canada Revenue Agency and Financial Institutions), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this week we passed a historic budget, a budget to build Canada and to build our economy the strongest in the G7.

Every member of the House knows that trade relationships across the world have changed. Our relationship with the U.S. has been fractured. Our Prime Minister is doing the right thing by travelling around the world to build up trade relationships.

On this side of the House, we are serious about building the strongest economy in the G7. The party opposite continues with its crazy line of questions.

* * *

[Translation]

TRANSPORTATION

Jason Groleau (Beauce, CPC): Mr. Speaker, members of the Standing Committee on Transport, Infrastructure and Communities have learned that the Liberal Party is encouraging the Driver Inc. scam.

Canada Post is awarding contracts to drivers who have not even been trained. It is unbelievable. It is shameful.

How can this government condone practices that jeopardize road safety and the lives of Canadian families? This has to stop immediately.

Will the Minister of Transport intervene in this matter, yes or no?

Sophie Chatel (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this government is dedicated to ensuring the safety of all modes of transportation. We are also investing heavily in all of our transportation infrastruc-

Oral Questions

ture. We are there to ensure the safety of infrastructure and transportation.

One thing is clear: Transportation in Canada is not only safe, but among the safest in the world.

Jason Groleau (Beauce, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the only security the Liberals care about is Brookfield's financial security.

It gets worse. The Liberal Party refuses to convene the Standing Committee on Transport, Infrastructure and Communities. It has been blocking the work for four weeks because it does not want to hear from victims of motor vehicle accidents. It is appalling. It is embarrassing. It shows a total lack of respect for the families who are waiting for answers.

Will the committee chair, the member for Vaudreuil, stand up and reconvene the Standing Committee on Transport, Infrastructure and Communities, yes or no?

Sophie Chatel (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, every motor vehicle accident is a shock to families. Our hearts go out to the victims of these accidents. That is why we are working with agencies, authorities and the provinces to ensure that these kinds of tragic events stop happening. We are strengthening our transportation and safety rules, and we are working collaboratively with all stakeholders in this sector.

* * *

• (1145)

[English]

NATIONAL DEFENCE

Philip Earle (Labrador, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, under Stephen Harper's decade of darkness, funding for Canada's military dipped below 1% of GDP for the first and only time ever. This had a very negative impact on military bases like 5 Wing Goose Bay in my own riding. Our new government, on the other hand, is committed to rebuilding, rearming and reinvesting in our Canadian Armed Forces.

Unlike the members opposite, I proudly voted for our budget, a budget that delivers generational investments in our capacity to strengthen and protect sovereignty. To those who voted against these investments in our defence—

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater): The hon. Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Treasury Board.

Tom Osborne (Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Treasury Board, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we live in an increasingly divided and dangerous world. We need to defend our people. We need to defend our values, our borders and our sovereignty. We need to be a strong and reliable partner for our allies.

Oral Questions

This is the largest investment in national defence in decades, and while the Conservatives voted against a pay raise for our Canadian Armed Forces and an increase in national defence spending, we supported our Canadian Armed Forces and will build them strong. We will build Canada strong because we believe in Canada.

* * *

NATURAL RESOURCES

Greg McLean (Calgary Centre, CPC): Mr. Speaker, potash is a critical mineral and a pillar of Canada's trade strategy, yet this week, Nutrien, a Canadian champion in potash, chose to put \$1 billion into a U.S. port project instead of building here at home. Why? It is because the aimless regulatory environment created by the Liberal government is too complex and unpredictable.

This is not just about potash; it is about Canada's ability to compete and lead in critical minerals and global trade. Why is the government letting Canada become the last choice for Canadian companies?

Claude Guay (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would note that this story has already been corrected. This is a commercial company-led decision and it is not final. Nutrien has said that a final investment decision will come in 2027, with any new terminal only online near the end of the decade.

We will keep engaging with Nutrien and others so that Canadian options are as competitive as possible. Canada has the potash the world needs, and potash is on Canada's critical minerals list because of its importance to food security and global supply chains.

Greg McLean (Calgary Centre, CPC): Mr. Speaker, let me provide the member with a quote: "This is a failure on Canada's part, a condemnation of our regulatory environment and our inability to permit port infrastructure the private sector actually wants to pay for." This is a government throwing money out the door while Canadian companies are walking out the back door.

Will the member please acknowledge that it is Liberal policies that are pushing investment out and reverse this regulatory mess?

Claude Guay (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are already investing heavily to strengthen trade corridors and port-rail capacity across the country. We have all seen the major announcements in the last few days and in budget 2025, and they include major long-term projects through the national trade corridors fund. These investments are aimed exactly at improving reliability, reducing bottlenecks and keeping the value chain here in Canada.

* * *

CARBON PRICING

Ned Kuruc (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Liberal government is the most expensive in Canadian history. Every dollar the Prime Minister spends comes out of the pockets of hard-working Canadians, driving up the cost of everything.

The Liberals had a chance to lower food costs for Canadians by scrapping the industrial carbon tax. They chose not to listen to Canadians. They chose to make food more expensive by increasing

it. The Liberals mislead and insult Canadians by calling this tax imaginary.

Why is the Prime Minister increasing the industrial carbon tax and making food more expensive?

Sophie Chatel (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Agriculture and Agri-Food, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, every Canadian deserves an affordable life and opportunities. Costco's CEO was at the agriculture committee yesterday with other grocers. On the cost of food and the factors that influence the cost of food, guess what they said. They all agreed that the main factor was weather conditions, like the droughts we have experienced recently, as well as commodity conditions and currency.

To be a responsible government—

● (1150)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater): The hon. member for Hamilton East—Stoney Creek.

Ned Kuruc (Hamilton East—Stoney Creek, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I do not think I can use the word "drought" as an explanation to the Stoney Creek Community Food Bank. Yesterday, it told me that in the last two months, 40% of the people who needed help were children.

Food prices have risen nearly 40% faster in Canada than in the U.S. The Liberals had a chance to lower food costs for Canadians by scrapping the fuel tax, but they chose to keep it. It will cost Canadian families up to 17¢ more per litre when they fill their gas tanks.

I will ask this again: Why is the Prime Minister keeping the fuel tax and making food more expensive?

Leslie Church (Parliamentary Secretary to the Secretaries of State for Labour, for Seniors, and for Children and Youth, and to the Minister of Jobs and Families (Persons with Disabilities), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, let me add to what my colleague just said to the House. The Canadian Climate Institute yesterday said, "Industrial carbon pricing has essentially no impact on the price of food and the agricultural sector." Farmers do not pay the industrial price.

Oral Questions

The air is a little thin on that side of the House today, and I would like to remind those members that they voted against making the national school food program permanent, they voted against the Canada child benefit, which went to families yesterday, and they voted against a tax cut for 22 million Canadians.

Marilyn Gladu (Sarnia—Lambton—Bkejwanong, CPC): Mr. Speaker, Canadians know that is not true. The fact is, the current Liberal government is the most expensive government in Canadian history. Every dollar the Prime Minister spends drives the cost of everything up, especially food.

The Liberals had an opportunity to scrap the industrial carbon tax to reduce the price of food, but instead they are increasing it, driving up the cost of fertilizer, farm equipment and food.

Why is the Prime Minister increasing the industrial carbon tax and making food more expensive?

Leslie Church (Parliamentary Secretary to the Secretaries of State for Labour, for Seniors, and for Children and Youth, and to the Minister of Jobs and Families (Persons with Disabilities), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the other side of the House does not want to listen to the facts and to the stakeholders that work in these areas, so let us come back to the Conservatives' record. Let us talk about the measures this House has put in place to make life more affordable for Canadians.

That side of the House says child care does not create spaces and dental care is a duplication. They say pharmacare is radical. They say school food programs are “garbage”. They say the Canada child benefit is redistribution. These are the very programs that help Canadian families have a more affordable life. They vote against them. This House stands for them.

* * *

FORESTRY INDUSTRY

Hon. Rob Moore (Fundy Royal, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the lumber industry is part of the backbone of my province of New Brunswick, and 80% of our lumber exports go to the United States. However, a pulp and paper mill in Maine is no longer accepting softwood lumber from New Brunswick due to tariffs.

When the Prime Minister took office, softwood tariffs were at 14%. They then rose to 35%. Now they are at 45%. The Prime Minister promised he would negotiate a win with the United States by this past July. He has broken that promise.

When will the Prime Minister stop selling out our lumber workers?

Claude Guay (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the forestry industry is the lifeblood and is so important for many communities, particularly in rural areas. That is why we have already announced a series of measures: \$700 million in liquidity, \$500 million for transformation and \$50 million for helping with salaries.

We are listening to everyone in the industry. I would love to work with my colleague, because we plan on announcing more measures to help the industry.

Hon. Rob Moore (Fundy Royal, CPC): Mr. Speaker, these workers are not asking for new programs. They want their jobs back.

These forestry workers are being left out in the cold by the Prime Minister. He is touring the world while tariffs on softwood lumber have tripled under his watch. The Liberals are not helping workers. The only thing they are helping is themselves, while Canadians lose jobs and families struggle to make ends meet, pay their bills or put gas in their cars.

When will the Prime Minister show some respect to hard-working Canadians and stop selling out our softwood lumber workers?

Claude Guay (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have been very clear on how important the softwood lumber industry is for this country and the government, and we will continue to support it while we navigate this.

The member may not remember, but it has been more than 40 years of discussions, tariffs and all kinds of activities with the American side. He knows this is a long-term dispute, but we will support our workers and our industry.

Todd Doherty (Cariboo—Prince George, CPC): Mr. Speaker, British Columbia used to be the largest producer of softwood in our nation. Since 2015, over 30 mills have closed in British Columbia, with 14 in Cariboo—Prince George alone. It has been 10 years without a softwood lumber agreement, and these guys, these Liberals, have done nothing but make it worse.

Tens of thousands of jobs have been lost. Just last week in Cariboo—Prince George, there was another mill closure, and 165 jobs were lost in 100 Mile House, gone because of Liberal incompetence.

When will the Prime Minister finally do his job and realize that forestry matters?

● (1155)

Claude Guay (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there are some people in this House who have historical amnesia. It has been 40 years that we have had problems with the American market for forestry trade.

We feel terribly sorry for the families that are affected by this. We will continue to do everything we can to support them. We are actively working on and hoping for a deal in the future with the Americans.

Oral Questions

Todd Doherty (Cariboo—Prince George, CPC): Mr. Speaker, in 2006, our former Conservative government put to bed the longest trade war with the U.S. government. We negotiated a one-year grace period, which these guys wasted.

We are tired of waiting. It has been 10 years, with tens of thousands of jobs lost. Our forestry workers do not need more programs or more handouts. They do not need charity; they need their jobs.

When will the Liberals wake up and realize that forestry matters?

Tim Louis (Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the King's Privy Council for Canada and Minister responsible for Canada-U.S. Trade, Intergovernmental Affairs and One Canadian Economy (Intergovernmental Affairs and One Canadian Economy), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like the member to know that our government knows that forestry matters. These tariffs on Canadian softwood lumber are unjustified. We are working at every level to fix this dispute.

In the meantime, our government is going to continue supporting workers. We are going to prioritize Canadian materials in construction, and we are going to change the federal procurement process to procure Canadian lumber.

We will continue to support Canadian workers and industries with Canadian products. Let us work together.

* * *

[Translation]

NATURAL RESOURCES

Steeve Lavoie (Beauport—Limoilou, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, last week, the Government of Canada announced its second tranche of major projects to build Canada strong.

A number of critical mineral projects have been referred to the Major Projects Office to accelerate their development. Critical minerals are key to Canada's economic development and national security.

Can the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources tell us more about one of these projects, the Nouveau Monde Graphite project in Quebec?

Claude Guay (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from Beauport—Limoilou for his question.

I was present at the announcement and I have met with the people of Nouveau Monde Graphite a number of times in the past. This project will provide significant economic benefits for Quebec, particularly in the battery industry. This project will be integrated with a battery material plant in Bécancour, which is also going to be built.

This project will strengthen the resilience of the Canadian economy and accelerate the transition to a clean economy. It will create more than 1,000 jobs and attract \$1.8 billion in investments in Quebec.

Our government is building a strong economy, building—

[English]

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater): The hon. member for Parkland.

Dane Lloyd (Parkland, CPC): Mr. Speaker, a new one-million-barrel-a-day pipeline will mean \$5 billion in additional royalties every year.

Canada exports over \$100 billion a year in oil every year. It is our largest export. It provides jobs, taxes and prosperity for all Canadians. However, under the Liberals, we will never be able to build a new pipeline to the west coast because of their shipping ban. While huge American tankers sit off our western shores, western Canadian oil is landlocked, and worse, we have to sell it to the Americans at a discount.

Why are the Liberals giving the Americans a Black Friday deal every day on Canadian energy?

Claude Guay (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we have an incredible opportunity to be a world-leading energy superpower in both clean and conventional energy. This government was elected to deliver bold nation-building projects that strengthen our economy, reinforce Canadian autonomy and advance indigenous prosperity, while contributing to clean growth and Canada's climate objectives. Yes, friends from the Conservative Party, we can do both. We are willing to work with all provinces, indigenous communities and Alberta to achieve these shared objectives.

Dane Lloyd (Parkland, CPC): Mr. Speaker, talk is cheap every day that the Liberals keep their shipping ban in place. The best way to protect and grow Canada's economy is to lift the Liberal shipping ban and start exporting our oil to markets other than the United States. The Liberal shipping ban prevents Canada from building a major new oil pipeline to the west coast to reach energy-starved Asian markets. The shipping ban costs us tens of thousands of jobs and billions in additional revenue every year. Under the Liberals, every day is Black Friday for Americans buying our cheap energy.

Why are the Liberals handing the Americans yet another win by blocking our biggest export?

• (1200)

Hon. John Zerucelli (Secretary of State (Labour), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is talking about infrastructure, but the Conservatives voted against the largest infrastructure investment in Canadian history. That is what our plan is delivering. We are going to be building roads, bridges, hospitals and major infrastructure in the nation's interest. Wages are up 3.5%. In October alone, Canadians created 67,000 jobs. When the Conservatives voted against the budget, they voted against workers, they voted against jobs and they voted against Canadians.

Oral Questions

Michael Kram (Regina—Wascana, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Northern Gateway pipeline was going to diversify Canada's export markets by selling Canadian oil and gas to the world, but the Liberals killed that project with Bill C-48, the west coast tanker ban, which keeps Canadian oil and gas landlocked. Worse still, the Liberals' tanker ban applies to Canadian ships only, not American ones.

If American ships can export American oil through Canadian waters, then why can Canadian ships not do the same with Canadian oil?

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is amazing to hear the Conservatives talk about pipelines. In 10 long years, how much pipeline did the Conservatives actually built to the tidewater, to the ocean? It was zero: not one inch of pipeline.

Talk is cheap, but we have a Prime Minister and a Liberal government pushing growth for our clean energy and energy in general. I think it is time the Conservatives come on board and support a government that knows how to get a job done and build Canada stronger.

* * *

HEALTH

Sima Acan (Oakville West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, while the Conservatives promise cuts, our government is making the investments needed to keep Canada's health system strong, including in communities like mine in Oakville West, where building up our health infrastructure is essential to meet the needs of our growing and aging population.

Can the parliamentary secretary tell the House what the government is doing to make sure Canadians can access the health care they deserve?

Maggie Chi (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Health, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, building a strong Canada means making generational investments in infrastructure. Budget 2025 delivers \$5 billion in the new health infrastructure fund, which will be strengthening hospitals, ERs and medical schools across the country.

Conservatives voted against investments like this in the House, yet their MPs never missed a ribbon cutting. However, we are glad they can come around. It is better late than never, though better never late.

On this side of the House, we are focused on delivering real results and building a stronger, healthier Canada for everyone.

* * *

IMMIGRATION, REFUGEES AND CITIZENSHIP

Scott Reid (Lanark—Frontenac, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the House unanimously adopted two motions, one affirming that a genocide is under way in China and the other calling on the government to “expedite the entry [into Canada] of 10,000 Uyghurs and other Turkic Muslims in need of protection, over two years starting in 2024”. That two-year period ends in a month, and as of yesterday, only 143 Uyghurs have been admitted to Canada by a govern-

ment that now calls the People's Republic of China a strategic partner.

How soon can we expect the remaining 9,857 Uyghurs to receive the protection we all agree they need?

Peter Fragiskatos (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Canada has been an example for the world, particularly when it comes to responding to the Uyghur issue in China, among other global crises affecting fundamental human rights. We continue to look at this issue, and we continue to put in place measures, but the hon. member knows that the circumstances are very challenging indeed. When individuals come to Canada, of course, a number of checks have to be completed, and there are a number of other challenges at play as well.

I invite the hon. member to have a conversation afterward, if he wishes.

* * *

NATURAL RESOURCES

Jenny Kwan (Vancouver East, NDP): Mr. Speaker, based on news reports, the Prime Minister appears ready to sign an MOU with Alberta that could green-light a brand new pipeline to B.C.'s north coast, behind closed doors, without B.C. at the table, by carving out an exemption to the tanker ban that protects our communities and our coast.

I ask the Prime Minister, will he commit today that he will not proceed with the project without the full consent of first nations and the Province of B.C., and will he honour the tanker ban and put a stop to this pipeline scheme?

• (1205)

Claude Guay (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Energy and Natural Resources, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, we are having very productive conversations with Premier Eby about responsibly advancing major projects. By the way, B.C. has already seen the highest number of projects move forward of any province. Any additional energy infrastructure in B.C. that is approved will be considered with direct input from both the provincial government and the indigenous community.

Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, yesterday in question period, and again today, we have heard allegations that are patently false that U.S. tankers are moving through the Hecate Strait, the area banned for the last 50 years under a moratorium honoured by B.C. and federal governments of all stripes.

Any suggestion of what the member for Regina—Qu'Appelle said yesterday, that U.S. tankers are moving “through the exact same place”, is patently false.

Routine Proceedings

Can anyone from the Liberal government benches explain whether the Liberals understand the tanker ban?

Wade Grant (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Environment and Climate Change, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, Saanich—Gulf Islands is right across from my community. I am a proud member of the Musqueam first nation, which is at the mouth of the Fraser River right as it flows into the Salish Sea, so I recognize and understand the vast biodiversity and the vast amount of beautiful wilderness right up and down the coast, including the Hecate Strait between Haida Gwaii and Prince Rupert.

As a proud member of Musqueam, I am proud to stand on this side of the House, committed to making Canada an energy superpower while protecting the environment, fighting climate change and seeking consensus with first nations and other partners.

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

[English]

GOVERNMENT RESPONSE TO PETITIONS

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, pursuant to Standing Order 36(8)(a), I have the honour to table, in both official languages, the government's response to nine petitions. These returns will be tabled in an electronic format.

* * *

SOFTWOOD LUMBER INDUSTRY

Hon. Arielle Kayabaga (London West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, there have been discussions amongst the parties and if you seek it, I think you will find unanimous consent to adopt the following motion:

That a take-note debate on the softwood lumber industry be held on Tuesday, November 25, 2025, pursuant to Standing Order 53.1, and that, notwithstanding any standing order or usual practice of the House:

- (a) members rising to speak during the debate may indicate to the Chair that they will be dividing their time with another member;
- (b) the time provided for the debate be extended beyond four hours, as needed, to include a minimum of 12 periods of 20 minutes each; and
- (c) no quorum calls, dilatory motions or requests for unanimous consent shall be received by the Chair.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater): All those opposed to the hon. member's moving the motion will please say nay. It is agreed.

The House has heard the terms of the motion. All those opposed to the motion will please say nay.

(Motion agreed to)

SAFE CONSUMPTION SITE

Sukhman Gill (Abbotsford—South Langley, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of the residents of Abbotsford—South Langley, who are requesting that an alternative location be found for a proposed supportive housing project planned directly across from Abbotsford Traditional School. The project would place a facility expected to include a safe consumption room within 60 metres of a field and playground used by students aged 11 to 18.

The petitioners call on the Government of Canada to restrict funding for BC Housing until a more suitable location is found for the supportive housing project and to ensure that the federal government follows the guidelines designated to protect children and their well-being.

INVASIVE SPECIES

Jacob Mantle (York—Durham, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am presenting a petition today on behalf of the people of Georgina in my riding, specifically the community of Keswick, about a new invasive aquatic plant called water soldier. It was discovered in 2024 by the water soldier working group and the Ontario Federation of Anglers and Hunters. It is a physical threat to human health because of its serrated leaves; it is a threat to our native plant and fish species, and it is a threat to local agriculture because of its proximity to the Holland River.

Therefore, the citizens in my riding are calling on the government to do three things: to identify water soldier as an invasive species under federal law, to nominate a single federal department to take ownership of this issue and to allocate sufficient funding and technical support to the water soldier working group to undertake remediation efforts.

● (1210)

FOOD SECURITY

Lori Idlout (Nunavut, NDP): Uqaqtittiji, I am honoured to rise on behalf of 42 petitioners calling for the reinstatement of the Inuit child first initiative program, which was also called the hamlet food voucher program. We all know that poverty is a major issue in Nunavut, where 57% of the households experience food insecurity, compared to the national average of 12.7%. The hamlet food voucher program was helping with, on average, about \$18 a day per child. That is not a lot of money, given the high cost of living, and it was unfortunate when the Liberal government decided to cut the program.

These 42 petitioners are calling upon the Minister of Indigenous Services to reinstate the hamlet food voucher program and the early years program in Nunavut communities.

GAZA

Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I am rising today to table a petition from Canadians who are deeply concerned about the urgent need for humanitarian aid in Gaza. The petitioners note that according to common article 1 of the Geneva Conventions, Canada must respect international humanitarian law. They highlight that article 59 of the fourth Geneva Convention requires occupying powers to allow impartial humanitarian relief and that Canada's international assistance accountability act mandates that our aid uphold human rights and international legal standards. They state that Israel's current policies violate these obligations.

The petitioners therefore call on the Government of Canada to reject militarized aid models; to restore access for UN agencies and NGOs, such as UNRWA and the World Food Programme; to permit safe entry for Canadian health care and humanitarian aid workers; and to ensure that all Canadian aid is delivered through internationally recognized, neutral and independent channels.

DISASTER ASSISTANCE

Michael Kram (Regina—Wascana, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to present a petition today on behalf of members of Regina's Jamaican community who are concerned about the devastating effects of hurricane Melissa, which recently struck that island. Of particular concern is the major damage the hurricane caused to hospitals in Jamaica. The petitioners have come up with a very innovative suggestion, which is to send ships from the Royal Canadian Navy to the region so that the medical facilities aboard the ships can be used to save lives until the hospitals on the island are back up and running.

I am please to have the opportunity to present the petition today in the House of Commons.

SERVICE ANIMALS

Elizabeth May (Saanich—Gulf Islands, GP): Mr. Speaker, we are past Remembrance Day, but we are always thinking of our veterans.

The petitioners want the House to recognize that veterans have been asking, for more than 15 years, to confront PTSD with the assistance of well-trained, life-saving animals. Trained service dogs make all the difference for veterans who are suffering from PTSD.

The petitioners ask that the House ensure we have the funding, the standard-setting and all the steps necessary to implement a framework to enhance Veterans Affairs Canada's provision of animal assistance services to veterans and their families.

AIR TRANSPORTATION

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Winnipeg North, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I table a petition today signed by many residents of Winnipeg North. What they are looking for is more international flights going out of the Winnipeg international airport over to Europe, ideally to India. Whether it is through members of the House or the Winnipeg Airports Authority, they want to see those flights enhanced.

* * *

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURN

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, if the government's responses to Questions Nos. 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 417, 418, 419, 420, 421 and 422 could be made orders for return, these returns would be tabled in an electronic format immediately.

● (1215)

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater): Is it agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

[For text of questions and responses, see *Written Questions website*]

Government Orders

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux: Mr. Speaker, I would ask that all remaining questions be allowed to stand.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater): Is it agreed?

Some hon. members: Agreed.

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

[English]

BUDGET 2025 IMPLEMENTATION ACT, NO. 1

The House resumed consideration of the motion that Bill C-15, An Act to implement certain provisions of the budget tabled in Parliament on November 4, 2025, be read the second time and referred to a committee, and of the amendment.

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the fine work that my colleague and friend does.

I want him to provide his thoughts on the Prime Minister talking about building Canada strong and making Canada the strongest of the G7 countries. What does that mean for him and his constituency?

Brendan Hanley (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Northern and Arctic Affairs, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, this is an important question. There are so many examples of how important the investments in the budget are for the Yukon.

Let me point out just one example. It is the \$1-billion Arctic infrastructure fund. It is about building and expanding transportation assets in the Arctic. It is about airstrips. It is about deepwater ports, all-season roads and sealift infrastructure that would support both civilian and defence purposes.

This is all about investing in infrastructure and investing in productivity. I cannot tell members how pleased people are in my riding and the entire Yukon to see this commitment to innovation, productivity, infrastructure and, going forward, building Canada and the north strong.

Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Mr. Speaker, I have a great deal of respect for my colleague.

We know that friendship centres are lifelines for indigenous people in urban communities, providing food, housing, safety, culture and belonging. The pressure on them is beyond the breaking point. Their core funding runs out in March, and this budget does not talk about sunset programs like funding for friendship centres.

Government Orders

Will my colleague do everything possible for the federal government to get to the table and renew funding for friendship centres because of the critical role they play for indigenous peoples?

Brendan Hanley: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the member for Courtenay—Alberni, who is a dear colleague of mine and a good friend. We have worked together on many issues we have in common.

I take note of the issue he raised. I know that friendship centres are also incredibly important in my riding. I will certainly commit to finding out more about this funding and how we can go forward to resolve this problem, ensuring that services and resources for the needs of the indigenous people in my riding are honoured.

Jacob Mantle (York—Durham, CPC): Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister had a clever slogan during the election: spend less, invest more. I know the Liberals are fond of slogans, and it was a good one, even in my opinion. Spending less sounds good and investing more sounds good. I want to believe the Prime Minister when he says that.

I think a lot of Canadians wanted to believe the Prime Minister when he said that. In fact, I think a lot of Canadians believed that promise, along with his promise to negotiate a win with the U.S., which we are still waiting for. That is probably why many Canadians voted for this Prime Minister. Let us give the Prime Minister the benefit of the doubt for a minute, believe him and assess his promise to spend less and invest more.

Is the Prime Minister spending less on operating expenses? No. The Parliamentary Budget Officer says, in fact, that the average deficit over the next five years will be double what was projected last year in the fall economic statement. The Parliamentary Budget Officer says, “This deterioration primarily reflects new ‘day-to-day’ operating measures and increased provisions for liabilities.” That does not sound like spending less.

The PBO goes on to say:

Absent measures since the [fall economic statement] and measures announced in Budget 2025, the day-to-day operating balance would be in a surplus position over 2026-27 to 2029-30. New operating measures since the 2024 FES and in Budget 2025 shift the day-to-day operating balance from a surplus to a deficit position....

“From a surplus to a deficit” does not sound like spending less either. In fact, it is the exact opposite. The PBO says we are spending more. Perhaps that is why the government is so mad at the PBO and is looking to fire him: He is telling the truth to Canadians. Well, thank God the PBO is here to tell the truth to the Canadian people, because we sure are not getting it from the government.

Let me ask the same question about the second promise, the promise to invest more. Is the Prime Minister investing more? No. Instead, the Prime Minister has dressed up normal operating spending and now calls it investment. Again, we have the PBO to thank for shining a light on the Prime Minister's attempt to cook the books. The PBO says, “the Government's definition of capital investments is overly expansive.” The PBO goes on to say that 30% of what the Prime Minister says is investment is actually just day-to-day spending. That does not sound like investing more. In fact, it sounds like spending more.

Again, I wonder if that is why the government is so intent on driving the PBO out of office. The Liberals do not like the rules and do not want to play by them, so instead they will get rid of the referee.

We have heard similar promises before. For 10 years, we have had Liberals in power promising us that deficit spending would make us richer. If I had a nickel for every time I heard the word “investment”, I would not be a politician.

We were told that even though the government was going to spend more, it was going to exercise financial restraint at the same time. In fact, in the last federal budget, some 18 months ago because they needed extra time, the Liberals set out three key fiscal anchors: the first was to cap federal deficits at about \$40 billion, the second was to maintain a declining debt-to-GDP ratio and the third was to shrink deficits to below 1% each year.

Unfortunately, budget 2025 breaks every single one of these goalposts. These goalposts were not selected out of thin air. In fact, it was the Liberal government that put them in place. In the 2024 budget, the Liberals said that reducing the federal debt-to-GDP ratio was “key not only for fiscal sustainability, but also to preserve Canada's AAA credit rating, which helps maintain investors' confidence and keeps Canada's borrowing costs as low as possible.”

The same government that said last year that these goals were so important to our AAA rating now wants us to believe that they are not important and that we should therefore adopt some new fiscal anchors. I think Canadians can be forgiven for questioning why that is.

● (1220)

The deficit has ballooned to over \$78 billion. Rather than lowering the debt-to-GDP ratio, budget 2025 will actually see it rise in this fiscal year and in the next several fiscal years. Last, deficits will not stay below 1% of GDP but will rise to 2.5% of GDP in this fiscal year. In fact budget 2025 shows that deficits will be above 1% of GDP well past 2030.

I know that the Liberals love to talk about our AAA credit rating, but what they do not like to talk about is what the credit agencies are saying today. In fact just after the introduction of this budget, Fitch, one of the international credit rating agencies, took note of the budget, unfortunately not in a good way, and said of Canada that “persistent fiscal expansion and a rising debt burden have weakened its credit profile and could increase rating pressure over the medium term.”

Fitch went on to warn the government, and I hope the Liberals are listening to this warning, that “the Canadian government has a track record of upward deficit revisions, with subsequent budget updates consistently worse than prior projections.... [F]ederal finances run a high risk of further deterioration.”

These are not my words, and they are not the words of the opposition; they are the words of our credit rating agency, upon which our AAA credit rating depends. That is a troubling analysis by the credit agency, because any change to that credit rating would be catastrophic and would lead to much higher debt interest charges for Canadians.

However, behind every number is a human story, a story of a family struggling to get by to make ends meet. I want to share just one of those stories from one of my residents, who wrote to me just after the introduction of the budget. His name is Ryan. He said:

I am writing to express my deep concern about the rising cost of living in our community....

I have lived in the same neighbourhood for more than a decade, and almost every essential cost of living has increased dramatically....

To illustrate this, I reviewed my own expenses from 2013 compared to 2025, and here are actual numbers from my household

This is how people budget: They keep track, and they assess. I hope the Liberals are taking notes.

Ryan said that groceries are up 200%; electricity, 133%; cable and Internet, 150%; vehicle insurance, 300%; fuel, 100%; water and sewer, 168%; accounting fees, 150%; and property taxes, 112%. He calculated that his personal cost of living has increased by 154% over the last 10 years. He said, “From my perspective, and from the perspective of many residents struggling with similar increases, this situation feels fundamentally unfair.” I agree; this is unfair to Canadians.

As of 8:45 this morning, every Canadian's share of the national debt is over \$30,000; in fact it is \$30,568. To that, add our provincial share. I am in Ontario, where that is another \$29,282, for a total of just shy of \$60,000.

Seven weeks ago this morning, I had my first baby girl, and that has changed my life dramatically, with increasingly less sleep. However, it also keeps me up at night that the federal government, by its actions, has handed my daughter a credit card bill of \$30,000. Before she has even taken her first steps in life, she has a federal debt.

However, I do believe there is hope for an affordable Canada. First, the government must return to its senses and drop the accounting gimmicks. Most important, it must treat every tax dollar with the humility and the sanctity of trust that it demands. Canadians work hard for every dollar they earn, and I want a future for my daughter and for all Canadians that is full of opportunity, not debt. That is a Canada I will fight for.

• (1225)

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, it is interesting that when I listened to Premier Doug Ford, a Conservative, he in essence said that we should pass the budget.

Government Orders

He was pleased that it actually passed, because he believes that we need a team Canada approach.

The Prime Minister is out and about securing more markets for Canadians. Exports are very important; we are a trading nation. We make up 0.5% of the world's population, yet we contribute 2.5% to world trade. Therefore when an individual like Premier Doug Ford says that this is a good budget that should pass, and that we should have a team Canada approach, what would the member say to him?

Jacob Mantle: Mr. Speaker, the other side loves to talk about a team Canada approach. While we all want Canada to succeed in its trade negotiations, especially with the United States, I have seen nothing of a team Canada approach from the government. It provides no information to Canadians about what the state of our negotiations is. In fact the chief negotiator for the Government of Canada was at the Standing Committee on International Trade on Monday, and he said that there are no negotiations ongoing with the United States right now.

Could the member tell me what the state of our negotiations is? What is the state of the most important relationship we have in the world?

• (1230)

[*Translation*]

Xavier Barsalou-Duval (Pierre-Boucher—Les Patriotes—Verchères, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I congratulate my colleague on the birth of his new baby. It can sometimes be quite challenging, but it is wonderful. I know something about that.

The Liberal member criticized my Conservative colleague for not voting in favour of the budget. I have to say that I could also criticize him for the same thing but for different reasons. Obviously, the Bloc Québécois is appalled by the budget. We submitted our requests for Quebec, but they were all denied, and then the Liberals were surprised that we did not vote in favour of the budget.

That said, the Conservatives' position surprises me. The budget that was introduced denies the importance of the fight against climate change and opens the door to oil companies and pipelines. That is the direction that this government has been taking since it got elected.

Why are the Conservatives continuing to vote against the budget when it supports a Conservative vision?

[*English*]

Jacob Mantle: Mr. Speaker, I may not agree with all of my Bloc colleague's points on the budget, but one thing I do agree with him on is that the government did not negotiate with the Bloc members. It did not speak to them. It did not take their demands seriously.

Government Orders

Canadians gave the government a minority mandate. I have heard, and I am sure the members opposite have heard, a desire from Canadians for Parliament to work together, but that was not on display with the government's budget. It did not take any of the opposition's criticisms seriously; in fact it rammed the budget through. Therefore I sympathize with the Bloc members, who did not get a fair negotiation with the government.

Todd Doherty (Cariboo—Prince George, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank our hon. colleague from York—Durham for already making an impact here in Parliament.

The member spoke of the generational nature of this budget in terms of the generational debt that it is levying against our future and our kids' future. One of the things I want to mention is that we are now spending more on servicing our debt than we are on health care transfers to our provinces. We are gripped in the middle of a mental health crisis, an opioid crisis in which more Canadians have died since 2016 than died in World War II.

I want ask our hon. colleague this: Is it just woeful negligence, or ignorance, on the part of the Liberals?

Jacob Mantle: Mr. Speaker, I would hazard to say it is both. The Liberals do not seem to know how to budget, and they do not seem to know how to keep promises. They told us in 2024 that fiscal restraint was important, but in 2025 they doubled the deficit. That is a debt that everyone's children and grandchildren will have to pay. In fact we spend more on interest payments now than we do on health care transfers and than all the money the government collects in GST.

I hope government members will take that to heart and get our budget under control.

Gord Johns (Courtenay—Alberni, NDP): Mr. Speaker, first I want to congratulate my colleague on his newborn baby. That is such a blessing.

In 2010 the Conservatives temporarily scrapped the 25% ferry import tariff, sending Canadian shipbuilding jobs to heavily subsidized foreign yards. The finance minister at the time said that the tariffs did not serve any purpose because the ships to which they applied could not be built in Canada. The tariff generated \$118 million over six years, and the Liberals permanently scrapped it. That money could have been building capacity in Canadian shipyards.

Does my colleague agree that we need to bring back that tariff and create a deterrent, reinvest in Canadian shipbuilding capacity here in this country, keep jobs in this country and build ferries here?

Jacob Mantle: Mr. Speaker, what I do agree with is that we need to figure out what the government has done with the tariff revenue, because Canadians do not know. It has collected, so it says, billions of dollars in tariff revenue from countertariffs: tariffs against Chinese products and tariffs against American products.

These are tariffs that are taken out of Canadian businesses, so I would like to know where the money is going. Maybe it should go to help our industries that are suffering, but the government has not told us and will not tell us.

[*Translation*]

Jacques Ramsay (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Public Safety, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, today I would like to take a few minutes to review the measures in the 2025 budget that will impact my constituents in La Prairie—Atateken. Last week, while walking down Saint-Pierre Street in Saint-Constant, I was able to see how the budget is addressing the concerns of the many people I spoke with.

I am going to start with Bill C-4, making life more affordable for Canadians act and its flagship measure, a substantial tax reduction that lowers the tax rate for the first \$57,000 of income from 15% to 14.5% and then to 14%, saving each taxpayer up to \$420 per year.

Furthermore, there is a pressing demand for housing in La Prairie—Atateken. In five years, the median price of single-family homes has risen from \$400,000 to \$639,000. That is an increase of 57%. Despite this, demand for housing in the towns in my riding substantially exceeds supply, driving up prices. People know that La Prairie—Atateken is a great place to live, which is why they want to move there, but it is becoming increasingly difficult to do so.

The average age of new home buyers has risen from 26 to 36 in the last decade. Couples and young families with children are struggling to save the down payment required for this purchase. Fortunately, the affordability legislation will give first-time homebuyers a GST holiday and allow them to save up to \$50,000 on the purchase of a brand new home. That is money they can put towards a down payment.

With Build Canada Homes, the government is also taking concrete action to address challenges to get housing projects built. This means things like cutting red tape, making it easier to access financing and allowing projects to be built on government-owned land. With investments totalling \$25 billion over five years in housing, we are boosting home construction and making housing more accessible. The goal is to cut construction time in half, reduce housing prices by 20% and do all this with less polluting, domestic materials.

● (1235)

[*English*]

Sustaining housing and infrastructure for first nations is also present in the budget, with \$3 billion affected for the construction of new lodgings, whether in urban or rural environments. Hence, a substantial amount of money will be made available for the Kahnawà:ke community, offering many possibilities for new houses.

Government Orders

[*Translation*]

Entering the job market is hard for young Canadians in La Prairie—Atateken and elsewhere. Fortunately, housing construction will require a new generation of builders and will generate several thousands of jobs.

The union training and innovation program, with its \$75-million purse, will support apprenticeship training for the major trades. Red Seal certification will also allow them to ply their trade anywhere in Canada.

Other programs are also available to support our young people, including the Canada summer jobs program, which has been substantially increased, the youth employment and skills strategy and the student work placement program. These will allow more young people to get that first job experience under their belts and, I hope, gain the confidence and skills they need to embark on a rewarding, well-paid career.

The government is also launching the youth climate corps, a significant innovation that offers paid training placements that teach participants green skills. The youth climate corps will help respond to climate emergencies, support community recovery and contribute to initiatives that strengthen community resilience in La Prairie—Atateken and across the country.

We may have paid particular attention to young people, but we have not neglected seniors. We have made several commitments to them. I am particularly proud to announce three initiatives aimed at combatting the financial exploitation of people who are often less familiar with new financial tools. For seniors, the government will propose a code of conduct for banking institutions aimed at preventing financial exploitation. It is also creating the financial crime agency, which will be tasked with stopping organized crime and on-line financial fraud. Finally, the national anti-fraud strategy will reduce the risk of individuals falling victim to fraudulent schemes, which are unfortunately constantly evolving and becoming increasingly complex.

When it comes to health care, it is increasingly difficult to retain much-needed personal support workers, the very people we called “the guardian angels of the health care system” not so long ago. I am also pleased to see the \$1,100 tax credit granted annually to personal support workers for the next six years.

Still on the subject of health, I also welcome the lowering of barriers to access the Canada disability benefit for low-income, working-age persons with disabilities. This affects hundreds of people in La Prairie—Atateken.

I also want to mention the dental care plan, which continues to grow as more and more Canadians become aware of this essential program. In a nutshell, Canadian residents with a family income of less than \$90,000 are quite likely to qualify. I encourage residents of La Prairie—Atateken who believe they are entitled to receive this service to find out more by calling or visiting Service Canada at the Brossard office.

For our children, Canada's national school food program should enable thousands of children in my riding to enjoy healthy meals at school, giving them an equal chance at educational success and

overall development. I would like to remind members that our party is making this program permanent this year, despite the incomprehensible and shameful opposition of the Conservatives, who went so far as to call this measure “garbage”.

In public safety, this government has taken several initiatives to ensure that Canadians feel safer in their homes and communities. I have spoken on several occasions in the House to praise the new investments and legislative tools now available to fight transnational gangs and organized crime at our borders and in our communities.

Today, I want to focus on initiatives that are less impressive but just as essential. For example, modernizing the Meteorological Service of Canada is imperative in light of the very real changes in our climate. Funding for the National Public Alerting System will allow for more accurate weather forecasting models and therefore more informed decisions to protect Canadians and their property.

Finally, I would like to say a few words about the economy. Companies in my riding are happy with budget 2025 because it offers several business opportunities. First, I want to mention the significant investments that will be made in national defence. It is important to remember that contracts should now be awarded locally rather than centrally, as has been the case in recent years. The fact that the Saint-Jean military base is nearby means that many companies in my riding of La Prairie—Atateken could soon be awarded service contracts.

Rather than focusing on any one sector in particular, it is important to focus on what is now known as the productivity superdeduction, which applies to all sectors of business, small, medium and large. The purpose of the superdeduction is to allow businesses to immediately write off a larger share of the cost of their new investments. That will encourage businesses to invest and grow. The deduction applies to scientific research and experimental development, as well as to capital assets, the cost of manufacturing or processing machinery and equipment, the cost of clean energy generation and energy conservation equipment and the purchase of zero-emission vehicles.

This is a \$110-billion investment that the government is making over five years to stimulate the economy. These measures will make Canada one of the most business-friendly countries in terms of tax benefits. Investments create a virtuous circle by growing the economy, which increases the GDP and generates more revenue for the state, which enables it to maintain its social programs so that no Canadian is left behind.

Everyone in La Prairie—Atateken will benefit from this budget, which should encourage them to look to the future with confidence.

● (1240)

Jason Groleau (Beauce, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have some questions about the budget.

Government Orders

On page 96, it mentions the importance of temporary foreign workers in certain rural areas. I come from a rural area where the unemployment rate is the lowest in Canada, at less than 3%. The Conservatives have proposed renewing all temporary foreign worker permits in regions where the unemployment rate is below 5%. This is essential to our region.

I see this in the budget, and I would like to get some details on my colleague's proposal.

• (1245)

Jacques Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, this is an issue that is close to my heart as well. In my riding, La Prairie—Atateken, there are also businesses that depend on temporary foreign workers. It is important to understand that our local workers also depend on these businesses that rely on foreign workers, so it is not a question of one or the other. We are building our economy together.

Our government is considering this issue. I believe that announcements will be made shortly, by sector and by region. I think we need a smart solution that benefits the places where it is needed.

Alexis Deschênes (Gaspésie—Les Îles-de-la-Madeleine—Lestiguj, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I would like to follow up on the question from my colleague who just spoke about temporary immigration.

I want to know what my colleague thinks about the request made, particularly by chambers of commerce, but also by many businesses, including some in my riding. They want a grandfather clause or some other measure to allow some sort of exception for temporary workers already on-site who speak French.

Jacques Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, I think these are valid suggestions that deserve to be studied. I think that Quebec in particular has more temporary workers because the process leading to permanent residency was more complex.

Certain things need to be checked with our provincial partners, including the Government of Quebec, but some things can certainly be done. The health of our economy depends on it. The health of our businesses depends on it. The same goes for Quebec's workers. We have to look at the big picture.

Pauline Rochefort (Parliamentary Secretary to the Secretary of State (Rural Development), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate my colleague on the excellent work he is doing in the House of Commons.

The budget includes a plan to develop our communities. This includes \$115 billion over five years for community infrastructure. Can my colleague talk about the impact this plan will have on the communities in his riding of La Prairie—Atateken?

Jacques Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, I think similar problems exist in my colleague's riding and in my riding of La Prairie—Atateken. As just one example, we hear a lot about housing construction, but there is an underlying problem, which is the lack of infrastructure needed to support that construction. With this measure, we will enable cities and towns to obtain subsidies to build the infrastructure needed to accommodate people, thereby increasing the density of our regions. Cities will also eventually have the means to improve public transit. We need to keep in mind that these things are all part of a whole.

[English]

Helena Konanz (Similkameen—South Okanagan—West Kootenay, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I recall that a year ago, there was chaos in this House when it was announced that there would be a \$40-billion deficit in an upcoming budget, and now the Liberals plan on doubling that. Does this concern the member of the Liberals?

[Translation]

Jacques Ramsay: Mr. Speaker, to answer the question I can simply go back to what I was saying earlier.

Investments create a virtuous cycle that grows the economy, increases GDP, and generates more revenue for the government. That is what our government is proposing to Canadians. Ultimately, Canadians sent us here to do just that. They believed in our plan, and we are delivering on it.

I think it will work. I think that in a few years, our economy will run smoothly and Canadians will thank us for the initiatives we are taking right now. It is a matter of trusting Canadians. We trust in the country and we trust our workers and businesses.

[English]

Michael Guglielmin (Vaughan—Woodbridge, CPC): Mr. Speaker, it is a great privilege to rise on behalf of the residents of Vaughan—Woodbridge. I rise today to speak to budget 2025 and the choice it represents for our country: whether we return to fiscal sanity and economic hope or we keep layering new debt and new bureaucracy on top of the old problems we refuse to fix.

Canadians remember how we got here. I want to take everyone back to just one year ago to the 2024 fall economic statement, which triggered a full-blown political crisis within the Liberal government. The deficit in that document was so alarming that the former finance minister walked away and resigned from cabinet and the government fell into chaos. The former finance minister found this deficit so preposterous and so outrageous that it ultimately led to the resignation of Prime Minister Trudeau.

Canadians were then told that a new prime minister, the current Prime Minister, a former central banker, would restore stability. They were promised a steady hand, fiscal responsibility and a break from the decade of recklessness.

Budget 2025 proves the opposite. The deficit that helped topple the last Liberal government has now been doubled. The Parliamentary Budget Officer projects deficits averaging over \$64 billion a year for the next five years. Public debt has blown past \$1.3 trillion. This budget alone adds more than \$320 billion in new debt over the next five years, more than twice what the previous Liberal government was on track to adding over that same period.

Government Orders

Let me break down the outrageous debt level so that people watching at home can get a proper scope of how disastrous the government is. It is roughly \$10 million in new debt every hour of every day. That is not renewal. This is indeed acceleration of the worst instincts of a Liberal government that has been in power for far too long. It is a government with no actual plan to get this country back on track. The budget implementation act, which we are debating today, would lock this path in.

Canadians were told there would be fiscal anchors. The Prime Minister promised to balance the operating budget within three years to ensure a declining deficit-to-GDP ratio and a declining debt-to-GDP ratio. However, the Parliamentary Budget Officer now says there is only about a 7.5% chance of meeting even the first of those anchors. He has testified that there is a low probability the government will respect any of its own targets. This means the anchors were not actually anchors after all.

Instead of fixing the problem, the government has tried to redefine it. In order to make the claim the Liberals will be balancing the operating budget, they have quietly rewritten what counts as capital spending. The Parliamentary Budget Officer has been very clear. This new definition of capital investment is “overly expansive”, and it goes far beyond what is used in our own public accounts and beyond international practice, including the system of national accounts, an internationally agreed upon standard for compiling measures of economic activity that is used in countries like the United Kingdom.

By shifting tax expenditures, investment tax credits and operating subsidies over to the capital column, the government makes day-to-day spending look smaller on paper. According to the PBO, if we were to use the widely accepted definition, so-called capital investment would actually be \$94 billion lower and operating expenses would be higher over the next five years than what the government claims. Under that more honest definition, the operating budget never actually balances at all.

Regardless of the fact the Liberals are trying to mislead Canadians to make it seem like they are competent stewards of the public treasury, debt is debt, and no matter how they cook the books, they are still adding an insane amount of money to the public debt. Creditors do not care which column the government hides it in. Every dollar the government borrows must be paid back with interest. Under this budget, interest costs alone will reach more than \$55 billion this year and grow toward \$76 billion by the end of the decade. That will be more than we send to provinces for health care and more than we collect in GST.

• (1250)

Fitch Ratings has already warned that the budget's massive spending increases and debt burden weaken Canada's credit profile and underscore what it calls “the erosion of the federal government's finances.” It notes that because fiscal rules are non-binding, “federal finances run a high risk of further deterioration.” Tax expert Kim Moody described this as “a horrible budget that will cripple our future generations.” As he put it, “The good parts are minor cameos, the bad dominates the middle, and the ugly rides off with our future saddled in debt.”

Canadians did not vote for this. Just six months ago, they were promised something completely different from the government. They were promised a \$62-billion deficit, which is already high enough, not a \$78-billion one. They were promised a declining debt-to-GDP ratio, but it is rising, and less spending, not \$90 billion more. They were promised fiscal anchors that would not be discarded in a matter of months. What people voted for and what they got are not the same thing, but is anyone surprised? They have been living this nightmare for the last decade.

I would like to move into the direct impact of this budget, because the damage caused by this recklessness is not just abstract.

In my community of Vaughan—Woodbridge and across the GTA, the housing crisis is the sharpest edge of these failed policies. Before the election, the government promised to build half a million homes a year. Today, we are not even close.

Home starts have cratered. From January to October, we have barely seen 200,000 starts nationwide. In the GTA, new home sales have collapsed. Compared with the recent 10-year average, single-family home sales are down by more than half. Condo sales are down by far more. Developers are laying off workers, projects are being shelved and young families are stuck. Plumbers, electricians, contractors and tradespeople are all feeling the pressure.

Development charges and the hidden taxes on new housing, coupled with GST and HST, can add hundreds of thousands of dollars to the cost of a home in the GTA. The cost of government now makes up roughly 30% to 40% of the price of a new home in the GTA.

During their election campaign in the spring, the Liberals promised to cut these charges in half. In the budget, that promise simply disappeared. There is no concrete plan to cut these costs, just frameworks, negotiations and more processes.

On housing, the government's answer is yet another bureaucracy: Build Canada Homes. It is as if the government wants our children to be renters forever. Do the Liberals want us to forget about the Canadian ideal of actually owning a home? It sure seems that way.

Government Orders

Instead of billions on housing measures that will not work, why do they not listen to industry? Why did they not listen to the municipalities and help support the reduction of fees and taxes that are preventing builders from building and keeping the price of homes out of reach? Why did they not steal our plan to remove the GST off all home purchases under \$1.3 million, not just for the first-time homebuyer?

This same instinct shows up in productivity. The Bank of Canada has warned that Canada is stuck in what it calls a “vicious circle of weak productivity”, a systemic problem that makes it harder to meet today's challenges and seize tomorrow's opportunities. The deputy governor has pointed out that regulatory burden and lack of competition are key drags on growth and has urged thoughtful, systematic efforts to reduce those barriers, yet this budget responds to productivity and regulatory issues by creating even more bureaucracy.

We get the new Major Projects Office, layered on top of existing departments and regulations, instead of a real fix for the broken impact assessment rules of Bill C-69 and Bill C-48. We get the new Defence Investment Agency, another organization headquartered in the capital, instead of procurement reform that would let Canadian firms deliver ships, planes and equipment on time and on budget.

My greatest concern is not just what this budget does to today's economy, but what it does to tomorrow's Canadians. Future generations have no vote on this budget, but they will live with its consequences. They will inherit a country where more and more of every tax dollar goes to bureaucracy instead of hospitals, instead of homes, instead of innovation and instead of jobs.

• (1255)

Conservatives believe in a different path, a path where government lives within its means so that Canadians can live within theirs. I voted against this budget and will keep pressing for a direction that restores discipline, creates room for investments and gives young Canadians a reason to believe that the country's best days are ahead of it, not behind.

Sima Acan (Oakville West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, budget 2025 clearly states that Canada possesses the lowest debt-to-GDP ratio in the entire G7, maintaining a strong AAA credit rating. Furthermore, the government's fiscal plan aims to achieve a crucial anchor: balancing day-to-day operating spending with revenues by 2028-29.

When the government successfully achieves its stated goal by 2028-29, the deficit will entirely support investments that grow the economy. These investments are designed to grow to \$1 trillion in total investments over five years.

Why did the Conservatives vote against the budget that supports what I just talked about?

• (1300)

Michael Guglielmin: Mr. Speaker, for years now, we have been hearing that investments will equal growth, but all we have is more debt and a slower economy.

Second, the government often loves to talk about net debt. The Liberals selectively use the term net debt versus growth debt measures, and they tend to ignore provincial and subnational debt.

When we take those into consideration, as a lot of other countries do for health care and education expenditures, we learn that our debt is actually among the worst in the G7.

I will not support a budget that adds increasingly more burdens on Canadians and straps future generations with debt.

[*Translation*]

Marilène Gill (Côte-Nord—Kawawachikamach—Nitassinan, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I must say that, as an MP from a forestry region, I hear the government talk about jobs and employment measures for young people, but I am not satisfied with what I am hearing. Yesterday, I learned that a wood processing plant in my riding is laying off 100 workers, with Christmas just around the corner. The government is doing absolutely nothing for the forestry industry.

I would like to know whether my colleague sees things the same way I do, not only with regard to the budget but also with regard to all of the government's actions in relation to the forestry industry.

[*English*]

Michael Guglielmin: Mr. Speaker, I share my colleague's concerns.

This budget is typical of a Liberal government. It promises everything and delivers nothing. We have never seen a budget that spends so much money and delivers almost nothing for individuals, nothing tangible. Could we expect any more? We have been living this nightmare for the last 10 years.

There is so much more that could have been done to create the conditions, including the environmental conditions, to see our economy prosper. Unfortunately, the Liberal government has underdelivered as it always does.

Carol Anstey (Long Range Mountains, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I want to give my colleague an opportunity to expand on the real-life consequences of this budget and the rising costs. I hear about them on a regular basis, and I am curious to know if he hears about them on a regular basis too. How are Canadians really impacted by the reckless spending of the Liberal government?

Michael Guglielmin: Mr. Speaker, Canadians are losing hope. We hear it at the doors every single day.

People are finding it harder and harder to get ahead. We see the statistics. There are 2.2 million people lining up at food banks. Can members believe that? In this great country, 2.2 million people are lining up at food banks and 700,000 of them are children. Young people cannot find jobs. They cannot afford housing.

When we meet with people in industry and ask how we can attract more investment into this country, we hear the same thing over and over again: The environmental conditions for business to flourish are not there. We are overly regulated and overly taxed, and we need to repeal these measures to make Canada a more competitive country again.

Aslam Rana (Hamilton Centre, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, all Canadians, unions, doctors and engineers, people from all walks of life, appreciate this budget, so why are the Conservatives still not happy with it?

Michael Guglielmin: Mr. Speaker, I have been pretty clear on that. We are not supporting this budget because it doubles the deficit. It adds over \$320 billion to the national debt. That is money we could be paying to health care transfers. It is more money than we collect from GST. There could be more money for programs that people need. Instead, we are mortgaging away the future of our children and our grandchildren, the future of this great country, and we are running roughshod over those who came before us to set us up for success.

• (1305)

Yasir Naqvi (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of International Trade and to the Secretary of State (International Development), Lib.): Mr. Speaker, thank you for recognizing me and giving me the opportunity to speak to Bill C-15, which is the budget implementation act and the overall budgetary policy of this government.

Let me start by recognizing and thanking the people of Ottawa Centre for giving me the opportunity to speak on their behalf in the House. It is an honour every time I get up.

Every single budget tabled on behalf of the Government of Canada, no matter which political stripe, is shaped by the context or moment in time we are living in. This moment is quite unique. We hear different expressions, such as a hinge moment, a pivotal moment and a moment of great consequence, and I think all of them are quite appropriate descriptions of the times we are living in.

We are seeing serious signals toward protectionism, especially by the United States, and tariffs are being imposed on countries that have been long-time friends and allies, like Canada, for no justifiable reason. We are seeing shifting geopolitical alliances between countries, and countries like Canada are considering what they should be doing to invest in the north or the defence sector. That is the context in which this budget is being presented.

The aim of this budget is to set Canada up for success in this changing economic and political environment. In fact, I would argue that it would be highly inappropriate if the government did not make bold decisions, as we see in this budget, because then we would not be responding to the challenges.

The big challenge we have to respond to is strengthening our economy to make sure that our country remains both politically and economically independent. It is imperative and something the Prime Minister spoke about. In fact, the most recent election was fought on that. What steps are necessary to make Canada an economically independent country so that we are less reliant on the

Government Orders

United States, are more focused on ensuring we trade with different parts of the world and are able to build our economy?

There are two big elements to make that happen that are part and parcel of this budget. One is to build one economy, as opposed to 13 in the country, and build the country east to west, which is the true axis of the country, with, of course, our northern coast and northern communities as well. This is as opposed to how we have always done business, which is from north to south and to the United States. This is something we have to reorient. In that process, we have to open up opportunities, through our Atlantic, Pacific and Arctic coasts, to other parts of the world. The investments my Conservative colleagues continue to oppose, which are part of this budget, are not just wasted money; they are being invested to build the infrastructure necessary for the economic independence of Canada.

There are a couple of other points I want to raise that I think are worth mentioning.

In this budget, there are no new tax increases. In fact, we are cutting taxes for over 20 million Canadians, especially those in the middle class, by lowering an income tax bracket. We have gotten rid of the divisive consumer carbon tax, which is helping families save money. We are cutting taxes. There are no new taxes in this budget, which is worthy of support.

In addition to that, we are not cutting any social services. We are making sure that Canadians get the help they need, whether through the Canada child benefit, the \$10-a-day child care plan, the Canada disability benefit, the national school food program being made permanent, old age security or the guaranteed income supplement. All those important supports that Canadians rely on are being maintained and protected in this budget.

• (1310)

That is an important element for me in my support for the budget, but there are four or five key points I want to raise that are important in the budget.

One is the focus on trade diversification. As I mentioned earlier, we need to make sure we are not reliant solely on trading with the United States. We need to diversify our trade. The Prime Minister and the government have set a target of doubling our non-U.S. exports over a decade; that is about \$300 billion that we are talking about. That will happen only if we engage with other parts of the world.

That is why the Prime Minister and members of the government are renewing our relationships and are rebuilding our alliances with other parts of the world, whether it is in Europe, the Indo-Pacific or the Middle East, to make sure that we are creating new opportunities for our businesses to do business.

We heard in question period earlier today that the Government of the United Arab Emirates has decided to invest \$70 billion in Canada. That is a huge gain, as are the free trade agreements we have signed with Indonesia. We are negotiating with Thailand, with the Philippines, with Mercosur and with ASEAN.

Government Orders

All of this will allow us to diversify trade and open new markets for our businesses.

The other big element of the budget is investment in infrastructure. We are talking about schools, hospitals and community facilities. As all of us often talk about, these is the infrastructure that our communities use, and we hear from our communities about it. The government is investing directly in our communities. It is going to support our constituents and make sure they continue to live a better quality of life. I believe that the number is around \$50 billion over the next few years that is being invested in our community. That is a really important investment. Again, building community assets that are going to support our communities is part of the budget.

The part I am quite excited about is Build Canada Homes, again, making sure we really deal with the housing crisis the country is going through by leveraging the capacity of the government to build more homes and to build them faster, to really leverage in that way a lot of the lands owned by the federal government. I know quite a bit about this because in my riding of Ottawa Centre there are a lot of federal lands ready to be repurposed and redeveloped to build affordable housing. There are neighbourhoods like Tunney's Pasture and Confederation Heights in my community, and there are buildings like the Jackson Building, which is right in downtown Ottawa, that could be repurposed for homes.

All those investments are going to create good homes for people.

There are also the superdeductions that are part of the budget. They are going to spur so much economic growth. They are going to ensure that there are new investments coming into our communities. Something the business communities have been asking for for some time is part of the budget so we can really attract private capital to be invested.

Last but not least, there is investment in our Canadian Armed Forces, to make sure that we not only meet the requirement of 2% of our GDP but also increase it to 5% to ensure the security and protection of our country from coast to coast to coast, especially the Arctic coast, so we protect not only us but our neighbours as well.

This is why I am supporting the budget. It is an investment in our country. It is a generational investment because it is investing in the generations ahead of us. Our responsibility is to build for them. That is what the budget is doing: building equity that we can then build on to create the prosperity that Canadians deserve and that we have always worked for.

Carol Anstey (Long Range Mountains, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I have a question around something that is really important to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador. There was some language in the budget around the oil and gas production cap: that maybe the government would get rid of it because it may no longer be necessary.

I am wondering whether the member opposite supports getting rid of the oil and gas production cap completely and giving a strong commitment around that.

• (1315)

Yasir Naqvi: Mr. Speaker, I support a sustainable economy. I support an economy that is driven toward the future. That would require the use of both conventional energy and renewable energy. I think that as a country we can do both.

This is a country made up of people who are creative and ingenious. I think that is the work we need to engage in, and we need to harness all parts of the country. We have a responsibility not only to our children but also as global partners. A sustainable economy is what I support.

Sima Acan (Oakville West, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his comprehensive speech and particularly for focusing on Canada's essential role in navigating global challenges and securing our economic independence. He highlighted the critical importance of growing and diversifying Canada's trade to build resilience, especially given the rapid reshaping of the global trading system.

The core fiscal strategy of the budget is to spend less so we can invest more. Could my hon. colleague please elaborate on how this commitment to fiscal discipline and strategic investment has enabled the government to launch such ambitious nation-building initiatives and strengthen Canada's sovereignty from coast to coast to coast?

Yasir Naqvi: Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to thank the member for Oakville West, who is the member of Parliament for my parents and does an amazing job. I remind her that my parents are the two most important constituents she has, and she recognizes that very important fact.

The fact of the matter is that the budget is focused on borrowing money not for our operating side, program delivery, but for the capital side. It is no different than what we all do in our lives. When we have to buy a house or a car, we go to a bank and get a loan. The reason the bank will give us a loan is that we are building equity; we are investing in something tangible.

That is precisely what governments need to do and what we are doing. We are investing in capital, whether that is building roads, community infrastructure, ports or highways. That is going to help grow our economy and make sure we have assets for future generations.

[Translation]

Marilène Gill (Côte-Nord—Kawawachikamach—Nitassinan, BQ): Mr. Speaker, we know that the government has used some creative accounting in its budget to magically turn debts into investments.

I would like my colleague to enlighten me on how, for example, security costs for the FIFA World Cup can be a government investment.

Yasir Naqvi: Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the member for her question.

[English]

What we need to really focus on is the reason the money is being borrowed. If it is being borrowed for the purposes of investing in economic growth, that is going to result in more prosperity, increasing the GDP. That is no different than what we would do in our personal lives when it comes choosing for what purposes we would or would not use our credit card. That is the discipline we are bringing.

I support the budget because we are investing in the infrastructure we need for our economic growth, not just today but also for generations to come.

Lori Idlout (Nunavut, NDP): *Uqaqtittiji*, I first met the member when I was in law school, and I have always admired his work and his reflections on indigenous issues as well.

I want to highlight, though, that the member mentioned there are no cuts to social services. I wonder if this is an oversight on his part, because there are important cuts being made to indigenous programs like the Inuit child first initiative and Jordan's principle. I wonder if the member can commit to working with relevant ministers so those indigenous programs are not being cut like the rest of the social services he mentioned.

Yasir Naqvi: Mr. Speaker, I also want to recognize the member for Nunavut. I have always learned from her, and I thank her for her thoughtful guidance. I had a conversation earlier with her about the supports that are necessary for indigenous communities, whether in the north or in my community, which a lot of members of the urban indigenous communities call home.

If there is guidance or clearance we need on some of the measures so those supports remain in place, I am absolutely committed to working with the member opposite to make sure we continue to invest in our indigenous communities in the north and in urban settings.

• (1320)

[Translation]

Marilène Gill (Côte-Nord—Kawawachikamach—Nitassinan, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in the House today, although I would have preferred to do so under different circumstances.

Of course, I am pleased to speak about the budget, but first I want to express my solidarity with the workers and their families from the Arbec plant in Port-Cartier, which announced less than 24 hours ago that more than 100 employees in my region would be losing their jobs. One hundred employees is 100 families. Many people are losing their jobs just before Christmas because the plant is closing indefinitely.

Of course, I stand with these workers. I would like to take this opportunity to challenge the government, which likes to talk about a “strong Canada” and claims to be creating jobs but then turns its back on all my constituents. Yesterday, even before learning about the closure of the Arbec plant, I had the opportunity to ask the Secretary of State for Labour some questions, which he was unable to answer. I expected a lot more from this government, which boasts about creating jobs and making the Canadian economy the strongest ever. In fact, long before the budget was tabled, the Prime

Government Orders

Minister had already sent a message to workers, telling them to look elsewhere, to upgrade their skills and to do something other than pursue a career in the forestry industry.

In my opinion, this does not send a very positive signal to the forestry industry. Even before the budget was presented, these workers had already been told that they were being abandoned. Now the budget confirms it. No funds are earmarked for forestry workers or the forestry sector in general. However, the budget does provide funds for pipelines and the western economy. Once again, the forestry sector is being abandoned.

Everyone knows that Bloc Québécois members talk about independence in the House. Given this situation, my colleagues will understand why we would rather manage our own money. For more than a decade, we have been living in a petro-monarchy where money is spent on polluting natural resources, namely dirty oil. The Bloc Québécois wants something else for Quebec: a sustainable future for ourselves, for our children, for future generations and for the planet. We would like to see the money invested in other things, but that is not what we are seeing here. Once again, the government is failing to support the forestry industry. I hope the secretary of state or the minister will be able to respond.

It is one thing to talk about forestry workers, but the solution is actually quite simple. We had requested a wage subsidy to maintain the employment relationship, as a strong signal to show that the government believes in the forestry industry. This request was denied.

We are not asking for loan guarantees. When things are going badly financially, no one wants to take out a loan when they do not know what tomorrow will bring. What the Bloc Québécois is asking for is an advance on countervailing and anti-dumping duties, and that is what the industry wants. However, we have still not received a response from this government. This measure should have been included in the budget. True, the auto industry is in crisis. The steel industry is also in crisis; we produce steel back home too. However, forestry is important. It is truly the identity of my region that is at stake today.

I would now like to discuss Correctional Service Canada. The budget calls for significant cuts of 15%. There is a penitentiary in my riding, and the correctional officers are worried about their future. Resources are already short, in terms of both personnel and security, and officers are not being provided with what they need to do their jobs. Now the government has decided to cut their pension funds. However, a pension fund is part of the negotiated salary. It is not separate. At a certain point, during collective agreement negotiations, workers decided to invest part of their salary in a pension fund. What the government is telling them is that what they negotiated does not matter and that it has decided to cut their pension fund. If that is what it means to help workers and build a strong Canada, then, as everyone already knows, I do not want to be part of Canada.

Private Members' Business

As for EI, which is very important in my riding, it is vital to remember that those who apply for EI are not doing it by choice. They are doing it because they have been hit hard, like the workers at the Arbec mill right now. In a rural region like ours, these tough setbacks also affect seasonal industries. Let me just mention that it is the industries that are seasonal, not the workers.

● (1325)

Workers want to work, but things need to get developed for work to happen. We have not even reached the development stage. Villages and entire communities are dying because this government does not want to lend a hand. It could tell workers that it is going to help them get through the year and get through the spring gap, that they can stay home and that someday, something might be developed. Right now, it is sending them the message, in the forestry industry anyway, that they are not important. It is sending the message that it does not want fisheries. It does not want or care about tourism. People who plant trees in the forestry sector do not matter.

For 10 years, the government has been saying that it plans to overhaul EI. EI is supposed to help workers, but it is not fit for purpose yet. For 10 years, I think that we still believed that reform was on the way. Now, no one expects the reform to happen. There is nothing, just nothing.

Helping workers also means helping young people. We know that the youth unemployment rate is high. We studied this in committee. Young people cannot even access EI benefits. As a result, young people's life plans and academic goals are at risk because they are not receiving support either.

Let us talk about the Canadian Union of Public Employees. The government says it is going to create jobs, but it is also going to eliminate 40,000 jobs. I want to know whether the jobs the government says it is going to create are quality jobs. There are a few numbers floating around. Will those jobs be unionized? Will those jobs come with benefits? Will those jobs be full-time jobs? Is it creating jobs just to create jobs? Does it even matter, given that the government has decided that cuts were necessary and that it thinks that good jobs are expensive?

That is another message the government is sending. It is saying that jobs do not necessarily need to pay well and that the public service is useless. In a region like mine where it is difficult or even impossible to access services, these people do crucial work, but they are not recognized for it. The government is once again eliminating jobs after promising to create them. The Canadian Labour Congress has asked how the government plans to create jobs by eliminating tens of thousands of them.

Let us talk about Canada Post. That interests me. I think its situation is rather unusual. The Minister of Government Transformation, Public Works and Procurement was going on about how much it costs to operate Canada Post, how unbelievably expensive it is and how the government can no longer provide this service. The minister did not even refer to it as an essential service. I would like to remind the House that Canada Post reported that half of its second-quarter losses, about \$253.5 million, occurred in June. Oddly enough, June is when Purolator suddenly began offering a 65% discount specifically to Canada Post customers. For those who may

not know, Canada Post owns Purolator. It owns a 91% stake in Purolator.

What Canada Post is doing is corporate cannibalism. Canada Post is basically eating into its own profits with Purolator's help. Yes, we want mail to be delivered. Of course we want it to be convenient and beneficial for all our businesses and for the entire population. However, in my opinion, there is a real lack of good faith here. The numbers are being fiddled. People know they can make numbers say just about anything. If we are being at all honest, I think that these numbers reflect a desire, probably on the part of Canada Post, to kill Canada Post.

I will conclude by saying that this is hypocrisy. It is not even budgetary window dressing. The government also boasted about passing anti-scab legislation. In the case of Canada Post, it seems that the situation is still going on because it is always possible to find replacement workers.

I also stand in solidarity with Canada Post workers and all the workers I mentioned, because the Bloc Québécois stands up for workers. We do not just pretend to stand up for them.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

● (1330)

[English]

ADDRESSING THE CONTINUING VICTIMIZATION OF HOMICIDE VICTIMS' FAMILIES ACT

Dane Lloyd (Parkland, CPC) moved that Bill C-236, An Act to amend the Criminal Code, the Corrections and Conditional Release Act and the Prisons and Reformatory Act, be read the second time and referred to a committee.

He said: Mr. Speaker, this may be the most important speech that I have given as a member of Parliament in my political career so far. That is because, as I think we can all agree in the House, the promises we make to our constituents, particularly constituents who are families of victims of crime, are the most important promises we make. I have been a member of Parliament for eight years, and this is the first opportunity I have had to bring forward this private member's bill.

The legislation was named in honour of Lyle and Marie McCann from St. Albert, Alberta. They were brutally murdered in 2010. Their killer is currently behind bars, but, to this day, we do not know the location of their remains.

I want to start by reading a statement from their son, Bret McCann, on behalf of the McCann family. It states, "On July 3, 2010, Travis Vader killed my parents, Lyle and Marie McCann. In early 2017, Vader received a life sentence for this despicable crime.

"Vader has never acknowledged that he committed this heinous crime.

Private Members' Business

“Our pain is everlasting. We will never forget, or forgive, what Vader has done.

“We know that it is critical for Vader's rehabilitation that he admit to having committed the murder of my parents. This is a prerequisite to any possibility of him ever having a role in normal society.

“As part of this admission, Vader would also need to provide authorities with the location of my parents' remains. It is very important to myself, and my family, that my parents' remains be located, and buried properly. I think it is a critical component of our grieving, and the one individual who knows where my parents' remains are has said nothing. Vader must reveal what he did with my parents' remains.

“‘No body, no parole’ laws have been enacted in Australia as a way of trying to bring closure to the families of murder victims. Similarly, the United Kingdom has implemented ‘Helen's law’.

“Like our Commonwealth partner countries [have done], Bill C-236 should be implemented in Canada as well.”

On July 3, 2010, 78-year-old Lyle and 77-year-old Marie McCann from St. Albert embarked on a road trip to British Columbia. They were on their way to pick up their daughter in Abbotsford, B.C. Tragically, they never arrived. On the evening of July 5, their motorhome was found ablaze at a campground near Edson, Alberta. The investigation led to the arrest and conviction of their killer, Travis Vader.

While it is rare for someone to be convicted of murder without a body having been found, a judge decided that the overwhelming amount of evidence meant he could conclude beyond a reasonable doubt that Vader had committed the murders. Vader is behind bars to this day, but he was eligible for parole as recently as last year. He has continuously refused to disclose the location of the remains of his victims, meaning that the family has never been able to hold a proper funeral and get that closure.

I believe that withholding information that would lead to the recovery of victims' remains is an ongoing crime against the victims' families. It is a crime that currently has no consequences. The idea that a killer could be released on parole while they continue to refuse to provide this information is abhorrent to Canadians.

What Bill C-236 proposes to do is to address this injustice by giving judges, parole boards and correctional authorities new powers to consider an offender's refusal to co-operate in disclosing the location of the victim's remains at sentencing, in parole hearings and in other release decisions. Currently, there is no requirement for an offender's refusal to disclose to be considered by judges or parole boards. The current bill seeks to amend three statutes: the Criminal Code, the Corrections and Conditional Release Act, and the Prisons and Reformatories Act.

The amendments to the Criminal Code seek to achieve this: At sentencing, after an offender has already been convicted, the court will consider their refusal to provide information on the location of their victims to be an aggravating factor. If the court decides not to consider the offender's refusal to provide this information at sentencing, it must provide the reasons for this decision. This seeks to

ensure accountability and transparency for victims' families, who all too often do not understand what is going on in the courts.

If an offender is sentenced for more than two years to life and refuses to provide information on the location of their victim's remains, the court has the discretion to order that parole will not be considered until half the sentence has been served, or 10 years, whichever is less. At sentencing, the judge would have to determine, based on the facts of the case, whether they believe the offender has material information that would lead to the recovery of victims' remains. In cases in which a judge does not believe an offender has this material information, the judge would have the discretion not to use these powers.

• (1335)

If these powers are used, and an offender later provides material information that leads to the recovery of the victim's remains, or if the circumstances leading to the order being put in place cease to exist, such as the remains being found, then the court would have the power to revoke this order.

The amendments to the Corrections and Conditional Release Act are as follows: The bill adds a proposed subsection under section 102 that the parole board has the discretion to refuse to grant parole if it deems that the offender is withholding information on the location of the remains based on the facts of the case as determined by the sentencing judge. It also proposes to add in section 116 that the parole board has the discretion to refuse to authorize unescorted temporary absences if it deems that the offender is withholding information on the location of remains.

The amendments to the Prisons and Reformatories Act are as follows: Co-operation in locating the remains of victims will be considered in granting temporary absences. These are circumstances in which an inmate may be authorized to leave prison because of humanitarian or other reasons. There is discretion to decline these requests if an inmate continues to withhold the whereabouts of the remains.

Private Members' Business

The Charter of Rights and Freedoms guarantees the right for an accused person not to be compelled to provide testimony. This would be incriminating against themselves. This is a very important constitutional protection. Bill C-236 does not create any consequences for an accused for the purpose of compelling information about the remains of their alleged victims. These legislative powers would only come into effect after an accused has been convicted of a crime involving the death of a person and when a judge has determined, based on the facts of the case, that the offender has material information they are withholding. It strengthens the tools available to the justice system to hold offenders accountable.

To be clear, if an offender does co-operate and the remains are found, this does not guarantee they will get parole. The parole board will still have to consider a number of factors, including whether they are a threat to the community and other factors.

It is worth emphasizing that the bill has been designed to ensure that judges, parole boards and correctional officials maintain full discretion to use these powers as they deem appropriate. In cases in which a judge decides not to use these powers, they can explain their decision so that families can have that accountability and explanation. These provisions are meant to prioritize the rights of victims and their families in keeping with the objectives of the Canadian Victims Bill of Rights.

Even though the McCanns' killer has been convicted and incarcerated, he continues to traumatize the family by withholding the location of his victims. Although it was the McCann story that inspired me to bring this case here today, in sad reality, it is not the only case.

In 2014, Kathy Liknes, 5-year-old Nathan O'Brien and 66-year-old Alvin Liknes were murdered in Calgary, Alberta. At some point in the early morning of June 30, their murderer disabled a lock on their home and broke in. The circumstances of this murder are graphic, disturbing and horrifying, and I will not speak of them in the House today. However, purely by coincidence, a photo shot by a camera on a plane owned by a digital mapping company showed their bodies lying face down on the property of the convicted person. When the same plane flew over the next day, the bodies were gone. Their killer was convicted on two counts of first-degree murder and one count of second-degree murder. He has refused to offer any details on the location of his victims' remains. He never expressed regret or remorse. The sentencing judge said it is hard to imagine "a more cunning, cruel and horrific set of circumstances".

There is also the murder of Lyne Massicotte. In July 2003, 43-year-old Lyne Massicotte was murdered in Quebec City. She was visiting the city to go on a date with a man she met online. It was not until early 2010 that police finally arrested her killer. According to information uncovered as part of an undercover police investigation, her killer admitted to strangling her and killing her. After violating her body, he dumped it on the banks of the St. Lawrence River. Although it has been over 20 years, the sisters and friends of Lyne Massicotte have been unable to find peace, because her remains have never been found. Her killer is eligible for parole in 2035.

There is the saga of missing and murdered indigenous women. Despite composing 4% of Canada's female population, indigenous

women make up 10% of missing women in Canada and 16% of all female homicides. The National Inquiry into Missing and Murdered Indigenous Women and Girls reported in 2019 that indigenous women are 12 times more likely to be murdered or go missing than non-indigenous women. In 2022, at least four indigenous women were murdered by a serial killer. The remains of Morgan Harris, Mercedes Myran and Rebecca Contois were found in landfill searches. However, the remains of the fourth victim, Ashlee Christine Shingoose, have never been found.

● (1340)

The killer has been convicted on four counts of first-degree murder. However, he has shown no remorse for his actions and has never co-operated in locating his victims' remains. This killer will be eligible for parole in 2047.

In my riding, there was the case of Samuel Bird this past summer. In June, a young boy, 14-year-old Samuel Bird of Paul First Nation, went missing. After an extensive search, his body was found just south of my town of Stony Plain on October 16, four and a half months after he was last seen alive.

I want to recognize the exceptional effort of all those involved. Despite investigators calling it "one of the most challenging cases [they] have been involved in", the unwavering dedication of police, his family and volunteers allowed for Samuel to receive a proper burial. His accused killer has been charged with 14 offences. While the family of Samuel Bird will be granted some closure by his remains being found, the accused made obvious concerted efforts to hide his body in the hopes that it would never be found.

In reaction to this recent case, the Assembly of Treaty Chiefs for Treaties 6, 7 and 8 made this resolution at its convention:

We support strengthening accountability by requiring offenders convicted of serious crimes to disclose information about the location of victims' remains before parole or sentencing consideration, recognizing its potential to bring closure and healing to families of [missing and murdered indigenous persons].

Just today, we received the shocking news that one of the killers of Laura Babcock, Dellen Millard, was downgraded from maximum security to medium security. Laura Babcock went missing in early July 2012. The pair of killers are believed to have disposed of her body in an animal crematory, and her remains have never been found. Despite no body being found, overwhelming evidence led to a conviction of first-degree murder.

Just yesterday, despite having stabbed another prisoner as recently as 2023, Millard was downgraded to a medium-security prison, and his co-conspirator Mark Smich has been enjoying medium-security prison since 2021. This was done despite a refusal on the part of the killers to admit to the crime they were convicted of, and they have never provided information about the location of Laura Babcock's remains.

Even though these killers have been convicted and are incarcerated, the trauma for victims and their families continues to this day. During the trial of Travis Vader, the McCann family killer, he claimed that he was not guilty because of a lack of physical evidence. He was convicted on an overwhelming body of evidence that proved beyond a reasonable doubt that he had committed the murders.

I have heard some argue that perhaps this legislation should not be enacted because those who are convicted of a crime may be innocent and this legislation could be used on them. My simple answer to them is that by that logic, why would we ever put anyone in prison if they claim they are innocent? We have a judicial system that protects the principle of the presumption of innocence, but once somebody has been convicted of a crime beyond a reasonable doubt, it is not up to the Parole Board to question the legitimacy of that decision.

Just last year, Travis Vader was up for parole, and the Parole Board was required to make only two key considerations: whether his release would pose an undue risk to society and whether his release promoted the protection of society. Travis Vader was never required to provide any material information that led to the recovery of his victims' remains. He was never required to admit the guilt of his crime, and he has not been held accountable for withholding this information from the families. Bret McCann has said that throughout court proceedings, Vader continuously mocked the McCann family by smirking and making obscene gestures.

The idea that somebody could be granted parole and be allowed to walk the streets in this country while they have information about the location of their victims' remains is abhorrent. It is an injustice, and this legislation seeks to solve it.

Just because a killer is prosecuted and incarcerated, that does not mean victims' families have full closure. In fact, victims' families could never have full closure, but not having the remains of their loved ones is an ongoing trauma that families face each and every day. As long as remains go unfound, it continues to impact victims' dignity and the well-being of their families.

I introduced this legislation because I believe families have a right to know where their loved ones are. They have the right to give them a proper funeral, and those who would deny them the fundamental decency of having their remains for a funeral must be held to account.

I have not made this a partisan issue. I hope that I can get support from all parties for this common-sense legislation that is needed to support families.

• (1345)

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, first and foremost, I would emphasize the sympathy that I think all members have for victims of this nature and their families. It is something we should all take very seriously, and I will expand on that shortly.

I am interested in the member opposite's thoughts in regard to judicial independence. Does he believe that judges do not take into

Private Members' Business

consideration that someone is withholding an important thing, such as where a body could be found, in making a disposition?

Dane Lloyd: Mr. Speaker, currently there is nothing that expressly requires judges or parole boards to consider these factors. There is nothing in our legislation that allows for judges to give an increased period of parole ineligibility when somebody is found to be withholding relevant information that could lead to the recovery of victims. I think these are novel powers that we would be giving to our justice system, novel powers that judges and parole boards would have the discretion to use as they see appropriate.

[*Translation*]

Claude DeBellefeuille (Beauharnois—Salaberry—Soulanges—Huntingdon, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate my colleague for introducing this bill. I can assure him that it has the Bloc Québécois's support.

Here is my question. The bill would allow judges to consider a person's refusal to disclose the location of a murder victim's remains or body as an aggravating circumstance. However, my understanding of the bill is that if the judge does not consider this to be an aggravating circumstance, the judge must put that in writing and justify their decision to not take it into consideration.

Have I correctly understood the spirit of my colleague's bill?

[*English*]

Dane Lloyd: Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly thank my colleague on the public safety committee and the Bloc Québécois for their indication of support for the legislation. The purpose of it is to provide accountability for families. It is always good, when we are talking about victims' families, to provide as much information as possible to explain the rationale and factors behind why decisions are made in our judicial system.

What I have sought to put forward is that when judges are choosing to not move forward with these powers, for whatever reasons, such as if they determine based on the facts of the case that they do not believe the killer has the material information, or they do not think it would be appropriate to put this power in, they would provide an explanation in writing so families could have some closure to understand why the powers would not be used in their family's case.

Private Members' Business

Todd Doherty (Cariboo—Prince George, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank our hon. colleague for bringing the bill forward. As a matter of fact, I have stood in the House, over the last 10 years, dozens of times to speak to this very issue with respect to the high-profile case in my riding of Cody Legebokoff, Canada's youngest serial killer, who murdered Cynthia Maas, Natasha Montgomery, Jill Stuchenko and Loren Leslie. When he was sentenced in 2016, Justice Parrett said that this gentleman lacks any remorse and should not see the light of day, yet he has been moved from maximum security to medium security without any of the parents' knowledge. When I pressed Corrections Canada and the former public safety minister on it, they told me that it is not an exact science.

I applaud our hon. colleague for the bill, and I would like to offer one more chance for him to talk about the victims' families, because that is really whom we are here for today.

Dane Lloyd: Mr. Speaker, something people have brought up to me and asked is whether it would really apply in a lot of cases. As I have outlined today, and as my hon. colleague outlined today, there are many cases where the legislation could be helpful in ensuring that killers who hide the remains of their victims' bodies are held accountable.

When I talk to the McCann family, and to all the families that have been involved in similar cases, I can see the trauma of not knowing and of wondering every day where their loved ones are. That ongoing trauma, I believe, is a crime. It is a crime that is not specifically recognized under the Criminal Code. There are no specific consequences for it, but it is a crime nonetheless, and the legislation seeks to create a tangible consequence for the people who would commit this crime against families.

● (1350)

Hon. Kevin Lamoureux (Parliamentary Secretary to the Leader of the Government in the House of Commons, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak to Bill C-236. I believe, at the end of the day, that all members of the House, and I would like to think all parliamentarians, can sympathize with the family members of victims in the situations being portrayed here this afternoon.

I suspect there are a number of very high-profile situations people can really relate to. The member himself, in introducing the legislation, referred to a situation that took place in my home province of Manitoba. It is something that I have been following for many years, which is the issue of murdered and missing indigenous girls and women. Back in 2010-11, I believe the number of people missing was well over 1,200, but some suggested it is 1,400.

One thing that people should be aware of is that we still have murdered and missing indigenous women and children today. It is occurring in our communities, and we do need to do more where we can. In big part, that means working with provincial jurisdictions, our different stakeholders, indigenous leaders and community members to ensure that women and girls feel safe in the communities they live in. We take that issue very seriously.

I would be remiss if I did not mention the circumstances that became a very hot political issue during the last provincial election in the province of Manitoba. There was a serial killer found out. I believe it was because there was a search of one of those steel

garbage cans in an alley, and a victim's body part was discovered. I do not want to say the perpetrator's name, the serial killer. I do not want to associate any sort of fame, as negative and as horrific as it is, to the individual.

Having said that, as best I can tell, there were at least four victims. The courts might be able to give a bit more detail as I did not follow it in that kind of detail. There were four victims, and it was believed fairly confidently that the bodies were dumped in a landfill site just north of the city. That had an impact not only on the families but also on the community, and it became a major issue during the provincial election.

To the credit of Premier Wab Kinew, there was an allocation of financial resources, which was complemented by federal resources. I must say, those federal resources were provided right at the very beginning. There was an extensive search of the landfill site. It was quite encouraging that we were able to recover at least some of the remains, those of Ms. Harris and Ms. Myran, which allowed for a proper traditional burial and brought some closure not only to their families and friends but also to the community as a whole.

I think we all understand the importance of trying to support the identification and return of the remains of victims to family and friends. I would like to believe that is supported by all members, no matter what side of the House they might fall on.

I asked a question of the member opposite in regard to judicial independence and, in handing out a sentence, what sort of disposition would be given by a judge. We have to recognize that judges have the opportunity today to consider everything, in essence, that is being proposed by the member opposite. If I was to provide a few very succinct comments on it, I would indicate that with the legislation, we would potentially create contradictions and shorter periods of parole ineligibility for first- and second-degree murder. That would result in judges having a choice to pick a shorter parole ineligibility period for these offences.

● (1355)

It would not necessarily have the effect of making parole ineligibility periods longer, as indicated. There is no guarantee of that, even with the legislation that is being proposed. As I indicated, when we think of related factors that can be and already are considered during sentencing, the court already has the power to delay parole eligibility, including for manslaughter.

I have always been a big advocate for the Charter of Rights. I can recall the signing of it. I was actually alive when it was being signed. I value the rights and freedoms we all have. I am not too sure that the legislation that is being proposed would actually be charter-compliant. I do not know whether in fact the member has an opinion on that issue. If I had a follow-up question, that would be what I would ask the member. There will be two hours of debate on the subject matter, but maybe in his concluding remarks, the member could provide some further thoughts on that issue.

Private Members' Business

The other issue I have highlighted in the questions, to expand on that, is that there has been a great deal of concern from some members of the House who do not necessarily recognize the full role our judges play in the courtroom. I am not convinced by what the member tries to give the impression of: that victims are not already served well through the current process. Looking at the legislation, comparing it to the charter and looking at the duplication, we see that there is no guarantee that we would be looking at extended periods of time if a body is not disclosed.

I have a great number of reservations with respect to the legislation. I would encourage the member to look at some of the other comments that have been made, even by him when he indicated he was not being political.

The Conservatives have made reference to the levels of our prisons. We have some prisons where there is a higher level of security versus a lower level of security. I believe we will find that there were child murderers who were transferred from maximum-security prisons to minimum-security prisons even when the Conservatives were in power. I am not quite sure why it was necessary to make reference to that today.

Interestingly enough, there is Bill C-14, the bail reform legislation, which deals with crimes by repeat violent offenders and others. It would have an impact in regard to the length of parole hearings and with regard to sentencing. I believe there are actually 80 different clauses that would be reformed. Bill C-14 is going to committee today. At the same time that it would be providing for stronger, healthier and safer communities, it would reinforce the fact that there are roles for the different levels of government to play.

I realize that the member has put a great deal of effort into the legislation. I would hope that in his concluding remarks he will address the two specific points I have raised. They are valid points, and for the government to support the legislation, the member would have to provide a justification for doing so, on those two points in particular.

At the end of the day, I believe that we have to do what we can for the families, friends and communities of victims. There will be another hour of debate before the legislation goes to committee, and we will have to wait and see what happens in the vote. However, at this stage, I do not see the government's supporting the legislation as it is.

• (1400)

[*Translation*]

Claude DeBellefeuille (Beauharnois—Salaberry—Soulanges—Huntingdon, BQ): Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss not to begin my speech on Bill C-236 by pointing out that Quebec's early childhood week is drawing to a close. Yesterday was National Child Day.

It seems only fitting to share that today, because it is a day for acknowledging that children are people and citizens in their own right who are entitled to freedom, safety and a life without violence. We must never forget that children are not only our future, but also our present, and we need to do everything in our power to take them into account, especially in our political decisions.

I thought it seemed appropriate to highlight that today, considering that many children in Quebec, in Canada and around the world are experiencing violence at this very moment. We need to reaffirm that children have rights. I would like to thank the community group ESPACE Suroît for sponsoring this awareness week in my riding.

We are here today to debate Bill C-236, introduced by my colleague from Parkland, with whom I have the pleasure of serving on the Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security. His bill seeks to amend laws such as the Criminal Code, the Corrections and Conditional Release Act and the Prisons and Reformatories Act.

Today we begin the second reading debate on this bill, which is part of a trend, a series of bills that have been introduced since the beginning of the parliamentary session. It may be worth reminding members that, this week, we debated Bill C-221, which aims to support victims' families and keep them informed of developments regarding the offender's sentence. Bill C-220 was also introduced, which also seeks to amend "the Criminal Code to provide that, in imposing a sentence on an offender who is not a Canadian citizen, a court must not take into consideration the offender's immigration status in Canada". That bill was introduced by the member for Calgary Nose Hill, who sits on the Standing Committee on Citizenship and Immigration and has been speaking on Bill C-12.

We also debated Bill C-225, which was introduced by another member who sits on the Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security, the member for Kamloops—Thompson—Nicola. This bill responds to the sadly growing phenomenon of domestic violence.

The government also introduced Bill C-14, which essentially covers six main points: It provides clarification on the principle of restraint, introduces a reverse onus for interim release, imposes tougher bail conditions, introduces sentencing measures, eliminates conditional sentences for sexual assault and makes amendments to the Youth Criminal Justice Act.

It is fair to say that, since the beginning of this Parliament, the legislative agenda has had a strong focus on crime, victims of violent offenders and bail. We have been very busy. As a member of the Standing Committee on Public Safety and National Security, I see that we will have a lot of work to do when it comes to hearing from witnesses on the various bills that will be passed at second reading and sent to committee.

I would like to thank my colleague from Parkland, who introduced this bill. He was motivated to introduce this bill because it responds to a real need. Lyle and Marie McCann of St. Albert, Alberta, disappeared 14 years ago. Their family cannot get closure because the murderer has never confessed to his crime. What is more, he refuses to reveal the location of Lyle and Marie McCann's remains. That is why this bill is called McCann's law.

I want to talk in more detail about the changes the bill would make to the Criminal Code.

Private Members' Business

This enactment amends the Criminal Code to add as an aggravating factor for sentencing purposes and as a reason to delay parole the fact that a person who is convicted of certain offences refuses to provide persons in authority with information respecting the location of bodies or remains. It also amends the Corrections and Conditional Release Act and the Prisons and Reformatory Act to add that fact as a consideration in the making of certain decisions under those Acts.

The amendments to the Corrections and Conditional Release Act and the Prisons and Reformatory Act are an important aspect of the bill.

• (1405)

In fact, the purpose of this bill is to consider the victims and the families who cannot grieve their loss because the location of their loved one's remains is unknown to them. Families, like the McCann family, suffer from not knowing the whereabouts of their loved one's remains, and many never get closure, as the bill's preamble explains.

The Bloc Québécois is aware of this reality and believes that the families of victims have the right to know the location of their loved one's remains. We consider it important that judges who choose to ignore this aggravating factor be required to provide a written explanation to help family members understand their decision.

In the past, little was said about victims' rights. In recent weeks, however, we have debated a number of bills that address them. This fall, we have talked at length about victims' rights only to conclude that victims also have rights, such as the right to information. They have a right to receive information during the parole process. They have a right to understand why the person who murdered their loved one can get parole after so many years. They have a right to understand and participate in the process. The bill introduced by my colleague from Parkland is another example of Criminal Code amendments designed to keep victims better informed.

The bill states that the court must be satisfied that the offender knows the location of the body. There may be extenuating circumstances. There was a case in Quebec where the person eventually revealed the location, but it was the St. Lawrence River. Obviously, it is nearly impossible to recover a body from the St. Lawrence River. The family of the victim, Lyne Massicotte, was never really able to mourn her death. After repeated questioning, the family finally found out that the murderer had thrown the body into the St. Lawrence. This brought them no comfort, as they could not arrange a funeral without her body. This is a very difficult situation for anyone to go through, and we understand how hard it must be for all the victims' families and loved ones.

As I mentioned at the beginning of my speech, the Bloc Québécois will be supporting the bill at second reading so we can hear from witnesses and experts in committee. We want them to explain what is being done in Australia, England and the United States. We want to know how other countries, with which we have many international relations, are addressing this new phenomenon, namely, the location of victims' bodies remaining undisclosed. Is it similar to what my colleague's bill proposes? We want to hear these testimonies.

As everyone knows, the Bloc Québécois believes in rehabilitating prisoners. We want to ensure that this particular aggravating

factor is introduced, but without it being punitive or coercive. We want judges to take aggravating factors into account and uphold their decision.

Right now, many families, who may even be listening to us, are experiencing grief that they cannot process because they do not know where their loved one's remains are. My colleague's bill aims to give families and loved ones the opportunity to obtain this information. If the accused provides the information, it could perhaps allow them to obtain parole a little sooner. This could allow loved ones to get emotional closure.

We believe that loved ones deserve better and that thorough work in committee will shed the necessary light on this issue, for the sake of the victims and their families.

• (1410)

[English]

Michael Cooper (St. Albert—Sturgeon River, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of Bill C-236 as its seconder. Known as McCann's law, it is in memory of the late Lyle and Marie McCann of St. Albert.

Lyle and Marie were a happily married, retired couple who had their lives cut short when they were brutally murdered in July 2010. For 15 long years, their remains have not been found. For 15 long years, the murderer has kept the whereabouts of their remains a secret.

Fortunately, that murderer was charged, tried and convicted and is serving a life sentence, but unfortunately, and frankly outrageously, this murderer is eligible for parole in less than 15 years. He took their lives. He murdered two people and he is already eligible for parole. He applied last year and he can do so without the Parole Board being required to give any regard to the fact that he refuses to disclose the whereabouts of the remains of Lyle and Marie McCann.

In light of that, McCann's law stands for one simple underlying principle: no body, no parole. That is right. That is just. That is fair. It gives judges, parole boards and correctional authorities the discretion, and I want to emphasize the word discretion, to hold murderers who refuse to disclose, and who hide material information about, the whereabouts of their victims' remains accountable under the law. This bill, McCann's law, does so in several ways.

First, it gives judges the discretion to treat a refusal to provide this information as an aggravating factor when fashioning a sentence. If a judge determines it not appropriate to treat it as an aggravating factor, they would simply be required to state their reasons for doing so to provide for some level of transparency and accountability.

Second, a judge would have the discretion to order the Parole Board to expressly give consideration to such a refusal in determining the appropriateness and suitability of the release of such murderers. It would also follow that correctional authorities would have the discretion in such cases to deny day parole and temporary absences for such murderers.

I was disappointed with the remarks of the parliamentary secretary to the government House leader when he suggested that somehow this bill is not charter-compliant. This bill could not be any more charter-compliant. I would submit it is airtight when it comes to its compliance with the charter, because it is entirely discretionary.

It would not impose, mandate or bind judges in any way; it simply provides that judges have one more tool at their disposal having regard for the particular facts and circumstances and the particular offender, nothing more, nothing less. Then, based upon that determination, parole boards and correctional authorities would also be able to exercise similar discretion. Again, they would be required to take into consideration something that is very material: a refusal on the part of a murderer to disclose the whereabouts of their victims' remains.

I want to commend my friend and colleague, the member for Parkland, for his tireless leadership in championing this legislation. He introduced this bill when he got to this place in the 42nd Parliament, as well as in the 43rd Parliament, in the 44th Parliament and now in the 45th Parliament.

• (1415)

As members can appreciate, it is difficult to get private members' bills to be debated and voted on, given that the House spends so much of its time on government business. Finally, in the 45th Parliament, McCann's law is here. It is being debated. It will be voted on. I certainly hope it is passed.

Most especially, I want to pay tribute to and pay my respects to the McCann family, who have gone through so much over these years, having lost a mother, a father and grandparents at the hands of a cold-blooded murderer.

I have gotten to know Bret McCann and his wife, Mary-Ann. They came to me as their member of Parliament to ask me to advocate for the repeal of so-called zombie laws. In the trial of the murderer, the trial judge, in error, applied an unconstitutional section of the Criminal Code that had been struck down but was nonetheless on the books, a zombie law. We advocated for the repeal of such laws and, to the credit of the government, it brought forward legislation that removed the zombie laws that were on the books at that time.

I know that the member for Parkland first met Bret and Mary-Ann at that time, when he was working in my office, which in turn led to where we are today, with the introduction of McCann's law.

Why McCann's law? Very simply, it is to remedy an injustice in our justice system that is illustrated by what has happened to the murderer of Lyle and Marie McCann. This is a murderer who took the lives of two innocent, elderly victims. They were on a road trip in the summer of 2010, heading to British Columbia. They stopped

Private Members' Business

near Peers, Alberta. They pulled over and spent some time in a relatively remote area. He took advantage of their vulnerability in that particular place, at that particular time. He robbed them, murdered them and disposed of their bodies.

Instead of taking any sense of responsibility, instead of showing any sense of remorse, he has cruelly and callously kept the whereabouts of their remains a secret, denying Lyle and Marie McCann a proper burial, depriving the family of Lyle and Marie McCann some comfort in knowing the whereabouts of their remains, their parents and grandparents, depriving the family of some degree of the closure that comes with knowing.

In being silent, this killer is not only cruel and callous, but, as the member for Parkland said, his actions constitute a crime. It is an ongoing, perpetual crime of retraumatizing the victim's family.

The member across the way said that family members take some comfort in the system as it currently stands. I can say with certainty that Bret McCann takes no comfort in the fact that the killer, the murderer, is eligible for parole, that he applied for parole last year and can do so year after year after year for the rest of his life or that the parole board does not have to consider the fact that this cruel, callous murderer, day in and day out, taunts Bret McCann and the entire McCann family by refusing to come clean about their whereabouts. Hence, we have McCann's law.

This is right. This is just. It is needed. It is targeted. It is discretionary. It will go a long way to protect the interests of victims in our criminal justice system. For Bret McCann, for the McCann family and for all the victims' families who are going through what the McCanns have gone through, let us do the common-sense thing and pass McCann's law.

• (1420)

Juanita Nathan (Pickering—Brooklin, Lib.): Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to have the opportunity to speak to Bill C-236, addressing the continuing victimization of homicide victims' families act. The short title of this bill refers to the continuing victimization of homicide victims.

The bill would make an offender's failure to disclose the location of victims' remains a consideration in parole decisions. I want to assure the member for Parkland, and indeed all my parliamentary colleagues, that this government takes its responsibilities toward victims seriously. We know the families of homicide victims have suffered unspeakable tragedy and we stand with them. They deserve our compassion, respect and support.

I am going to use my time to outline the ways victims are already supported by the government. For example, in 2015, the Government of Canada created the Canadian Victims Bill of Rights, which enshrined victims' rights into law. The Canadian Victims Bill of Rights provides the statutory rights to information, to protection, to participation and seek restitution.

Private Members' Business

On a practical level, this means that victims have the right to receive information about the justice system and about the services and programs available to them. Victims may also obtain specific information on the progress of a case, including information on the investigation, prosecution and sentencing, as well as the conditional release process of the person who harmed them and how the sentence is administered. Importantly, victims have the right to have their security and privacy considered at all stages of the criminal justice process. They also have the right to have reasonable and necessary protection from intimidation and retaliation.

The Canadian Victims Bill of Rights gives victims the right to convey their views and have those views considered. Victims may participate in meaningful ways by attending Parole Board hearings and submitting or presenting victim statements about the physical, emotional or financial impact that offences have had on their lives for consideration at any parole review. The Parole Board of Canada can then take all of this information into account when making its decision.

Victims can also propose specific conditions for consideration in the board's decision-making. For example, geographic conditions or no contact orders can be imposed if an offender is granted release. Victims can also access a photo of the person who has harmed them prior to release. If the Parole Board of Canada does not impose any conditions requested by victims, they are also eligible to obtain written reasons.

Under the Canadian Victims Bill of Rights, victims of crime are legally entitled to receive information on progress made by inmates toward meeting the objectives of their correctional plan. They can also name a representative to receive information on their behalf. Additionally, victims have the right to have the court consider making a restitution order and have an unpaid restitution order enforced through a civil court. At sentencing, victims are allowed to submit a victim impact statement describing the losses they have suffered because of the crime committed against them.

Further, courts need to consider ordering restitution for all offences. An offender's ability to pay restitution is one of the factors a court will consider, but it does not prevent a court from making the order. A court must consider restitution as part of the totality of the sentence.

The factors considered when determining an appropriate sentence include the seriousness of the offence, any payments already made by the offender and the impact of the crime on the victim. There is a range of losses that can be covered by restitution, including damaged or lost property due to the crime, physical injury or psychological harm, costs related to moving out of the offender's household, costs that victims of identity theft incur to re-establish their identity and correct their credit history, and costs that victims of the non-consensual publication of an intimate image incur to have an image removed from the Internet.

The Government of Canada remains committed to empowering victims of crime with resources such as the national office for victims. It is an important resource for victims that improves how they experience federal corrections and conditional release programs.

• (1425)

The office provides a victim lens on correctional policy development as well as developing information products for disseminating to victims and the general public. These information products are aimed at increasing awareness so victims can better understand and navigate the process related to federal correctional and conditional release. It also engages with victims, their advocates and other stakeholders to ensure that their voices are heard in the development of the office's services and supports.

Finally, the national office for victims considers the unique needs of victims in vulnerable communities, including indigenous peoples, in all of its work. The process around correctional and conditional release can be confusing, complicated and overwhelming for victims, but services like the national office for victims can help victims understand their rights.

It is important I mention that there is a complaint mechanism. If a victim feels that their rights under the Canadian Victims Bill of Rights have been infringed or denied by a federal agency or a department, they can make these complaints directly to the relevant department or agency to have issues resolved directly and in a timely manner. However, should they be unsatisfied with the outcome of the internal complaint process, they may also contact the Office of the Federal Ombudsperson for Victims of Crime.

The Federal Ombudsperson for Victims of Crime operates independently and at arm's length from the Government of Canada. While the ombudsperson does not advocate on behalf of individual victims or provide legal advice, they can make recommendations to the federal government in response to the issues raised, provide information or refer complaints to victim services.

The government will continue to stand in support of victims of crime. No system is perfect, and there is always room for improvement.

Jeff Kibble (Cowichan—Malahat—Langford, CPC): Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to thank my colleague the member for Parkland for his excellent work, dedication and passion over eight years to help make the lives of victims and their families better.

[*Translation*]

I would also like to thank our Bloc Québécois colleagues for their support.

Private Members' Business

[English]

I would ask that all members make this a non-partisan issue and support what we know, as indicated earlier, would withstand a test of charter compliance. I ask that all members support the bill, which would make lives better for families like the McCanns and for all Canadians.

The Assistant Deputy Speaker (John Nater): The time provided for the consideration of Private Members' Business has now ex-

pired, and the order is dropped to the bottom of the order of precedence on the Order Paper.

It being 2.30 p.m., the House stands adjourned until Monday at 11 a.m., pursuant to Standing Order 24(1).

(The House adjourned at 2:30 p.m.)

CONTENTS

Friday, November 21, 2025

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Budget 2025 Implementation Act, No. 1

Bill C-15. Second reading	3935
Kelly	3935
Lamoureux	3936
Deschênes	3937
Cobena	3937
Kuruc	3937
Rana	3939
Deschênes	3939
Jansen	3939
Lamoureux	3939
Lavoie	3939
Gladu	3941
Deschênes	3941
Joseph	3941
Hanley	3942
Jansen	3943
Rana	3944
Kuruc	3944

STATEMENTS BY MEMBERS

Joline Robertson

May	3944
-----------	------

Henry Farm Tennis Club

Chi	3944
-----------	------

Francophone Community Milestones

Anstey	3944
--------------	------

Community Funding in Hamilton Centre

Rana	3944
------------	------

Saskatchewan's Holodomor Memorial

Kram	3945
------------	------

Forty-eight-hour Bike Challenge to End Violence Against Women

Ntumba	3945
--------------	------

Normand Lapointe

Groleau	3945
---------------	------

Shuah Roskies

Bardeesy	3945
----------------	------

Cost of Food

Aboultaif	3946
-----------------	------

Vanier Cup

Barsalou-Duval	3946
----------------------	------

Canadian Soccer Excellence

Naqvi	3946
-------------	------

The Budget

Kusie	3946
-------------	------

Hindu Heritage Month

Nathan	3946
--------------	------

Prime Minister of Canada

Moore	3947
-------------	------

World Menopause Month

Fortier	3947
---------------	------

Prime Minister of Canada

Thomas	3947
--------------	------

Terry McHale

Maloney	3947
---------------	------

ORAL QUESTIONS

International Trade

Seeback	3948
Solomon	3948
Seeback	3948
Naqvi	3948
Anstey	3948
Solomon	3948
Anstey	3948
Naqvi	3949

The Economy

Hardy	3949
Solomon	3949
Hardy	3949
Lamoureux	3949

Climate Change

Deschênes	3949
Fortier	3949
Deschênes	3949
Fortier	3950
DeBellefeuille	3950
Fortier	3950

International Trade

Cooper	3950
Long	3950
Cooper	3950
Naqvi	3950
Mantle	3950
Solomon	3951
Mantle	3951
Zerucelli	3951

Finance

Albas	3951
Church	3951

Albas	3951
Long	3951
Holman	3951
Osborne	3952
Forestry Industry	
Gill (Côte-Nord—Kawawachikamach—Nitassinan)	3952
Guay	3952
Gill (Côte-Nord—Kawawachikamach—Nitassinan)	3952
Guay	3952
Finance	
Généreux	3952
Zerucelli	3952
Généreux	3952
Church	3953
Anderson	3953
Long	3953
Transportation	
Groleau	3953
Chatel	3953
Groleau	3953
Chatel	3953
National Defence	
Earle	3953
Osborne	3953
Natural Resources	
McLean (Calgary Centre)	3954
Guay	3954
McLean (Calgary Centre)	3954
Guay	3954
Carbon Pricing	
Kuruc	3954
Chatel	3954
Kuruc	3954
Church	3954
Gladu	3955
Church	3955
Forestry Industry	
Moore	3955
Guay	3955
Moore	3955
Guay	3955
Doherty	3955
Guay	3955
Doherty	3956
Louis	3956
Natural Resources	
Lavoie	3956
Guay	3956
Lloyd	3956
Guay	3956
Lloyd	3956
Zerucelli	3956
Kram	3957
Lamoureux	3957

Health	
Acan	3957
Chi	3957
Immigration, Refugees and Citizenship	
Reid	3957
Fragiskatos	3957
Natural Resources	
Kwan	3957
Guay	3957
May	3957
Grant	3958

ROUTINE PROCEEDINGS

Government Response to Petitions	
Lamoureux	3958
Softwood Lumber Industry	
Kayabaga	3958
Motion	3958
(Motion agreed to)	3958
Safe Consumption Site	
Gill (Abbotsford—South Langley)	3958
Invasive Species	
Mantle	3958
Food Security	
Idlout	3958
Gaza	
Johns	3958
Disaster Assistance	
Kram	3959
Service Animals	
May	3959
Air Transportation	
Lamoureux	3959
Questions Passed as Orders for Return	
Lamoureux	3959

GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Budget 2025 Implementation Act, No. 1	
Bill C-15. Second reading	3959
Lamoureux	3959
Hanley	3959
Johns	3959
Mantle	3960
Lamoureux	3961
Barsalou-Duval	3961
Doherty	3962
Johns	3962
Ramsay	3962
Groleau	3963
Deschênes	3964

Rochefort	3964
Konanz	3964
Guglielmin	3964
Acan	3966
Gill (Côte-Nord—Kawawachikamach—Nitassinan)	3966
Anstey	3966
Rana	3967
Naqvi	3967
Anstey	3968
Acan	3968
Gill (Côte-Nord—Kawawachikamach—Nitassinan)	3968
Idlout	3969
Gill (Côte-Nord—Kawawachikamach—Nitassinan)	3969

PRIVATE MEMBERS' BUSINESS

Addressing the Continuing Victimization of Homicide Victims' Families Act

Lloyd	3970
Bill C-236. Second reading	3970
Lamoureux	3973
DeBellefeuille	3973
Doherty	3974
Lamoureux	3974
DeBellefeuille	3975
Cooper	3976
Nathan	3977
Kibble	3978

Published under the authority of the Speaker of
the House of Commons

SPEAKER'S PERMISSION

The proceedings of the House of Commons and its committees are hereby made available to provide greater public access. The parliamentary privilege of the House of Commons to control the publication and broadcast of the proceedings of the House of Commons and its committees is nonetheless reserved. All copyrights therein are also reserved.

Reproduction of the proceedings of the House of Commons and its committees, in whole or in part and in any medium, is hereby permitted provided that the reproduction is accurate and is not presented as official. This permission does not extend to reproduction, distribution or use for commercial purpose of financial gain. Reproduction or use outside this permission or without authorization may be treated as copyright infringement in accordance with the Copyright Act. Authorization may be obtained on written application to the Office of the Speaker of the House of Commons.

Reproduction in accordance with this permission does not constitute publication under the authority of the House of Commons. The absolute privilege that applies to the proceedings of the House of Commons does not extend to these permitted reproductions. Where a reproduction includes briefs to a committee of the House of Commons, authorization for reproduction may be required from the authors in accordance with the Copyright Act.

Nothing in this permission abrogates or derogates from the privileges, powers, immunities and rights of the House of Commons and its committees. For greater certainty, this permission does not affect the prohibition against impeaching or questioning the proceedings of the House of Commons in courts or otherwise. The House of Commons retains the right and privilege to find users in contempt of Parliament if a reproduction or use is not in accordance with this permission.

Also available on the House of Commons website at the following address: <https://www.ourcommons.ca>

Publié en conformité de l'autorité
du Président de la Chambre des communes

PERMISSION DU PRÉSIDENT

Les délibérations de la Chambre des communes et de ses comités sont mises à la disposition du public pour mieux le renseigner. La Chambre conserve néanmoins son privilège parlementaire de contrôler la publication et la diffusion des délibérations et elle possède tous les droits d'auteur sur celles-ci.

Il est permis de reproduire les délibérations de la Chambre et de ses comités, en tout ou en partie, sur n'importe quel support, pourvu que la reproduction soit exacte et qu'elle ne soit pas présentée comme version officielle. Il n'est toutefois pas permis de reproduire, de distribuer ou d'utiliser les délibérations à des fins commerciales visant la réalisation d'un profit financier. Toute reproduction ou utilisation non permise ou non formellement autorisée peut être considérée comme une violation du droit d'auteur aux termes de la Loi sur le droit d'auteur. Une autorisation formelle peut être obtenue sur présentation d'une demande écrite au Bureau du Président de la Chambre des communes.

La reproduction conforme à la présente permission ne constitue pas une publication sous l'autorité de la Chambre. Le privilège absolu qui s'applique aux délibérations de la Chambre ne s'étend pas aux reproductions permises. Lorsqu'une reproduction comprend des mémoires présentés à un comité de la Chambre, il peut être nécessaire d'obtenir de leurs auteurs l'autorisation de les reproduire, conformément à la Loi sur le droit d'auteur.

La présente permission ne porte pas atteinte aux privilèges, pouvoirs, immunités et droits de la Chambre et de ses comités. Il est entendu que cette permission ne touche pas l'interdiction de contester ou de mettre en cause les délibérations de la Chambre devant les tribunaux ou autrement. La Chambre conserve le droit et le privilège de déclarer l'utilisateur coupable d'outrage au Parlement lorsque la reproduction ou l'utilisation n'est pas conforme à la présente permission.

Aussi disponible sur le site Web de la Chambre des communes à l'adresse suivante :
<https://www.noscommunes.ca>